

[3rd December 1952]

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Sir, scarcity conditions might have been there for a long time; but after some time, the cumulative effect of continuous scarcity conditions brings about a grave situation. Anyway I do not wish to argue with you, Sir, on that point. I would be glad to know from you, Sir, some examples of admissible motions.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I will give them. When we amend the rules, we shall also clearly say when Members can bring forward adjournment motions.

“ As regards this motion of Mr. Ramachandra Rao, it is not an urgent matter, and therefore, I rule it out of order.”

IV.—GOVERNMENT BILLS.

- (1) THE TANJORE TENANTS AND PANNAIYAL PROTECTION BILL, 1952.
(L.A. BILL NO. 12 OF 1952).

MR. SPEAKER :—“ Yesterday, Mr. Venkateswarlu was addressing the House in regard to his amendment to clause 13. He may now continue the speech.”

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—“ అద్యక్షా, ఇంకో ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు మాట్లాడుతున్నారు. వారి ముగించిన తర్వాత మాట్లాడుతాను. అది వారు వినాలని నా కోరిక—I want him to hear—

‘ఈ సవరణ ప్రధానమైనటువంటి సవరణ. దీన్ని నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను. దీనిలో ఉన్నటువంటి విషయమేమిటంటే యిప్పుడు కోర్టులో యీ కాలూదార్ల తరపున, పన్నయాల తరపున ఎవరైనా మాట్లాడవలెననే ఉద్దేశ్యం ఉన్నట్లైతే, అటువంటిప్పుడు ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు, అంతగా అవసరమైతే వాళ్లు చెప్పకోటానికి తప్పకుండా అవకాశము యిస్తామని చెప్పారు. అదినూడా రూల్సులో వాళ్లకు representation ఉండటం చేస్తామని తెలియజేశారు. కాని యిది సరికొత్త పద్ధతికాదు. Act లోనే యీ విషయము ఖచ్చితముగా ఉండాలి. అంతేకాని ప్రధాన మంత్రిగారు చెప్పిన దానికి యింకా మార్పులేమైనా రావచ్చును. అవసరమైన చోట్లు ఉన్నప్పుడు అందరికీ అవసరమే ఉంటుంది. అసలు యీ యాక్టులో general గా tenants అందరికీ ముఖ్యంగా tenants అందరికీ యీ హక్కు ఉండాలి. ఎవరైనా చెప్పకోటానికి ఏమి లేకపోలే చెప్పకోనేందుకు వారి తరపున representation ఉండాలంటే వారికి తప్పకుండా యీ అధికారము ఉండాలని కోరుతూ యీ సవరణను బలపరుస్తున్నాను.’”

11-50
a.m.

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this amendment which seeks to add two sub-clauses to clause 13.”

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—“ Only sub-clause (6-A) is now under the consideration of the House.”

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—“ There are five sub-clauses in the clause and a new sub-clause is proposed to be added. In that connexion, I wish to point out that even now under the Criminal Rules of Practice private agents may appear either on behalf of the accused or the complainant and this practice holds good in criminal courts, but of course it has to be done with the

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar]

permission of the presiding Magistrate and he can at his discretion allow it. This practice has been in force in our State for a long time, for nearly fifty years. When such procedure is permitted even in criminal courts, I do not think this amendment is in any way objectionable. But in view of the new sub-clause (6-B) now proposed, I think that with some modification the Government can accept the new sub-clause (6-A). Instead of saying—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be entitled to appear in person or to be represented by any agent not being a legal practitioner.’

a slight modification might be made so that it will lay down that—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be represented by an agent including a legal practitioner or not necessarily being a legal practitioner.’

I submit that the exclusion of the legal practitioner sought to be made by this amendment is not a happy thing because either the tenant or the landlord may require the assistance of a legal practitioner. If the tenants want the assistance of a legal practitioner, we should not try to exclude such assistance; and therefore, I suggest that with the modification suggested by me it would be all right. I submit that in view of the fact that the practice of allowing private persons in criminal courts, has been in force in our State, the amendment is necessary and with the modification I have suggested, I support the amendment.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is a matter of legal procedure. Let me take the first part. It is said that—

‘Any party to a proceeding under this Act before the Conciliation Officer or before the Revenue Court shall be entitled to appear in person or to be represented by any agent not being a legal practitioner.’

If we take the words ‘not being a legal practitioner’, a rule or law like this is totally unnecessary because for justice to be done a person should not be prevented from either appearing in person or being represented by an agent. A re-statement of the general law is I think wholly unnecessary. But on behalf of the Government I can promise that we shall be issuing rules in regard to this matter which will be on a line with what obtains under the Code of Criminal Procedure and I am thinking of a rule in these terms. My hon. Friend knows that it is not an amendment but it is going to be issued as a rule—

‘Whenever in any proceeding before a Revenue Court, where a party is represented by a legal practitioner and the other is not, the Court may, in its discretion, permit any agent or any person authorised by such party to plead on his behalf provided that the Court may at any stage cancel such permission.’

Hon. Members may like to know why it is proposed to frame a rule on these lines. Legal practitioners are subject to the discipline of the High Court and they are bound by certain rules of ethics and conduct. If any person other than a legal practitioner is allowed to appear on behalf of the party it will be allowing a person to take part in the proceedings of the court who is subject to no discipline. It is, therefore, necessary to provide for permission to be given when the court thinks it fit, and if afterwards the person’s behaviour calls for it, the court should have the

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[3rd December 1952]

right to withdraw the permission. Otherwise he would have considerable difficulty. That is why provision is made for the cancellation of the permission at any stage of the proceedings. Even in the ordinary courts, those who are not legal practitioners are allowed under those conditions only. Suitable rules will be framed and that would be enough to cover the case. A statement of the law here that every one is entitled to be present is wholly unnecessary unless indeed the object of the Mover was as originally proposed to prevent legal practitioners from appearing in the court, which I think, must be given up—and it is likely to be given up because there is no question of a person not being entitled to be represented by a legal practitioner and that is always taken for granted. But the only thing that is wanted is to make provision for the presence of someone to be there on behalf of the tenants and that can be provided only with suitable restrictions. With these words, I oppose the amendment."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am unable to understand why the Hon. the Chief Minister is so non-receptive to this idea. I put it very strongly, Sir, he is non-receptive to this idea. In his reply to the suggestion from this side of the House that a provision for revision by District Courts must be made, he made it quite clear that he was providing for a piece of legislation which will cost the least to the parties. If it is a question of costly litigation, whatever benefits are sought to be conferred upon the parties by the legislation cannot be availed of by the parties concerned, particularly by the tenants and the pannaiyals. So, here is a position wherein the ordinary procedure applying in the case of the civil and criminal courts cannot obviously apply because under the normal rules of practice in the criminal courts costly litigation results and only in a few cases are private parties allowed to represent particular parties. Those rules should not provide us with an analogy because we are thinking of providing for a machinery by means of which justice could be done cheaply and readily. This is one of the fundamental things that we have got to remember. Mention has been made about discipline and it has been said by the Hon. the Chief Minister that legal practitioners are subject to the discipline of the High Court. But in that connexion, I would like to point out to him that to my knowledge since 1937, in this State, there have been courts which did not deal with criminal questions nor with disputes pertaining to property but they dealt with disputes arising between employees and employers and they were clothed with all the powers of a civil court. These courts have been in existence for the last fifteen or sixteen years but during this long period of time, there was not a single instance brought to the notice of anyone where the people who represented the workers in the courts, and who were not legal practitioners subject to the discipline of the High Court, misbehaved. After all, Sir, why should they misbehave? Is it to their interests or the interests of the parties that they represent that they should do so? I am afraid,

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

Sir, that the Hon. the Chief Minister has failed to appreciate one factor and that is, when I appear before a court, what would be my interest? It would be to see to it that I appeal to the better side of the court."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"That is the first stage."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"The Hon. Minister knows that I have appeared in a number of such cases in Coimbatore."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM:—"We have no personal spite against Mr. Ramamurthi."

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am not talking about myself. A number of trade union representatives who are not legal practitioners and therefore, not subject to the discipline of the High Court, appeared in such cases."

"Sir, but there has not been a single case where it was stated that he has infringed the discipline of the High Court or has misbehaved. It is not in our interest to misbehave. On the other hand the question is that the law provides that lawyers alone can appear and a private practitioner can appear only under sufferance when the Revenue Court in its discretion allows him to do so. We are not certain that in every case the Revenue Court will allow him to appear on behalf of a tenant or a pannaiyal. There may be some cases where it may not allow him and what is the remedy? There is no remedy provided for in this clause. Is it provided, for example, that the orders of the Revenue Divisional Officer can be changed in any other court? No. He can use his discretion not to allow a private practitioner to appear on behalf of a tenant or pannaiyal. Then where is justice going to be done?"

12
noon.

"With regard to the draft rule mentioned by the Hon. Chief Minister, I must say that only in such cases where the landlord is represented by a legal practitioner and the tenant or pannaiyal is not able to engage the service of a lawyer, will the Revenue Court exercise its discretion. Now, it obviously happens in certain cases that the landlord himself directly appears. Then what is the position? The landlord, we know, in to-day's society and under the conditions that are existing to-day generally happens to be an educated man. He commands respect from the court and there is a greater amount of receptivity when the landlord speaks before a court. When the pannaiyal speaks, he is generally taken to be an illiterate person, and he cannot put forward his case as effectively as a landlord by virtue of the fact that the landlord happens to be a more educated man. The pannaiyal is placed at a tremendous disadvantage. As in the case of trade union disputes, the tenant or pannaiyal must have the right to choose his own representative irrespective of whether the landlord engages a lawyer or appears in person and the court must accept him. If he misbehaves in the court he can be sent out. I would, therefore,

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

request the Hon. the Chief Minister to make such a provision in this clause, as otherwise justice cannot be rendered to tenants or pannaiyals."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I shall certainly have regard to all that has been urged by the hon. Member and the rule will be properly framed. I may omit the first condition if he wants it to be done straightway. As regards the discretion—whether it should be negative or positive prohibition—that also would be duly considered when the rule is framed. Eminently this question is concerned with the practice of law. We also come into conflict with the provisions made for legal practitioners under the Legal Practitioners Act. All these will be considered and we shall issue a suitable rule. I want the hon. Member to withdraw his amendment."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" In view of the assurance of the Hon. the Chief Minister, I do not press my amendment."

The amendment was, by leave of the House, withdrawn.

Clause 13 as amended was put and carried.

Clause 14.

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" In view of what has happened yesterday, I am not moving my amendment."

Clause 14 was put and carried.

Clause 15.

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Sir, I move in clause 15—

(i) For the words "to areas outside Tanjore district" occurring in the head line, substitute the words "to areas other than Tanjore district in the State of Madras".

(ii) In sub-clause (1) for the words "in any neighbouring area outside the Tanjore district" substitute the words "in any area other than Tanjore district in the State of Madras".

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member, by his amendment, wants to enlarge the scope of this Bill."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" I want that the provisions of this Bill should be extended to other districts in the State."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then it is out of order. Anyhow let me hear what the Government have to say on this amendment."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" I respectfully agree with what the Chair has said. The Bill is with reference to the Tanjore district and certain other adjoining areas where similar conditions prevail. This amendment seeks the extension of the Bill to the whole State."

3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" I rule the amendment out of order but I allow the hon. Member to speak on clause 15."

* SRI P. PUNDARIKAKSHACHARYULU :—" Sir, there is agrarian unrest throughout the State since 1947 when the then Government issued a questionnaire regarding land reforms and it has become more acute from the time the Agrarian Reforms Committee appointed by the Congress submitted its report and from 1949 when the then Government appointed the Land Revenue Reforms Committee and issued a questionnaire regarding the proposed land revenue reforms, the landlords, the inamdars and the zamindars apprehending some agrarn reforms conferring some rights on cultivating tenants are continuing to evict tenants. It can be seen from the report of the Land Revenue Reforms Committee that there has been large-scale eviction of tenants throughout the State. Sir, there is a lot of litigation going on in the civil and criminal courts. There is much agrarian unrest throughout the State and, therefore, I request the Government to suitably amend the Bill so that it can be extended to other districts also. If it is not possible to extend the Bill to other districts, at least let them issue an Ordinance or come forward with a similar Bill with such modifications and adaptations so that it may apply to the whole State. With these words, Sir, I resume my seat."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I did not support 12-10 or oppose so far any of the amendments as far as this Bill is concerned because I am in full agreement with the general principles p.m. and the trend of the Bill. While referring this Bill to a Joint Select Committee, I expressed the hope that the Joint Select Committee would make sweeping changes in the Bill. But that has not happened. If I have to say anything of the Bill as it stands now, it is that it does not go far enough. In the first place it does not sufficiently protect the rights of the tenant. It does not make his position any the less precarious or his position more secure. It does bring about certain changes. But I feel it does not satisfy modern conscience. On the other hand, as far as the concessions to the landlord are concerned, I believe it has not done even what the Central Government recommends in their Five-Year Plan, where the landlord is not expected to get more than one-third. But the Bill, as it stands to-day, gives nearly two-thirds. To that extent, I believe the Bill is . . ."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" May I interrupt the hon. Member for a second. I submit, Sir, Dr. Menon is under the mistaken impression that we are now discussing the Bill for the third time. It is not so. We are now on the discussion of the amendment."

* DR. K. B. MENON :—" Sir, I thought that I could, while speaking on this clause, recommend to the Government that this Bill should be extended to other areas in this State and that I could point out also the defects in the Bill.

" Then, Sir, another criticism that I have to offer against this Bill is that the Bill differentiates between industrial labourer and

[Dr. K. B. Menon] [3rd December 1952]

farm labourer. That discrimination to my mind is not quite justifiable. Both of them should be treated alike; and all the privileges that the industrial labourer enjoys should be extended to the farm labourer. Finally I would say that it has not replaced individual capitalist holding by corporate or co-operative ownership. After all we are not interested in converting the tenant of to-day into the landlord of to-morrow. That does not solve the problem. Our social objective is co-operative ownership or corporate ownership. That also the Bill does not achieve. Even though the Bill is defective in very many respects, I do feel the extension of the Bill to other areas in this State would be beneficial and I wish the Government take the earliest steps to do it."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, if the amendment is pressed . . ."

MR. SPEAKER:—"No, he is not moving it."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"May I speak on clause 15, Sir?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is a Government amendment to it. Let the Hon. Minister move his amendment first."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to move—

"In sub-clause (2), for the words "any modifications", substitute the words "such modifications" and for the words "they are so laid", substitute the words "it is so laid"."

Sir, it is a matter of verbal amendment to make the clause more elegant."

*SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment that stands in my name is not necessary if I get certain information. Now, the clause says that the Government may, by notification, make rules to carry out, etc., etc. My object in giving notice of my amendment is that this is a piece of delegated legislation. We are empowering Government in this clause to make rules to carry out the purposes of this measure."

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I take it, Sir, we are now on clause 15 and not clause 16. Mr. Ramamurthi is now speaking on clause 16."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I am sorry, Sir."

*SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"Sir, on clause 15 I want to say that at present, as Government are aware and as Members also are aware, there is a fairly heavy demand in the country that the security of tenure to the tenant and other benefits conferred on the Tanjore tenants may be extended to the tenantry in the whole State. But Government have found some difficulty in making the provisions of this Bill suitable for general application. All the same they have introduced this particular provision in that,

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

they can extend them by notification. Sir, I was one of those who had always objected to giving extensive delegation of powers to the Executive, as the one, to extend the operation of the entire Bill to the entire State just by a mere notification. But I am glad to say that on our suggestions, the Hon. Chief Minister in the Joint Select Committee agreed to certain amendments and they now find a place in sub-clause (2). In so accepting those amendments I appreciate the action of the Hon. Chief Minister, for it serves to go as a precedent in legislative drafting. It also recognizes the right of the Legislature that whenever modifications are sought to be made hereafter they should be brought before the Assembly for its approval before they are put into operation."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I want to know whether this amendment now under discussion is to omit clause 15."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is now a general discussion on that clause. If the hon. Member wants to oppose this clause, he may do so."

* SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR:—"Sir, some years back when the Malabar Tenancy Act was passed we were told that that measure was intended to deal with the special conditions of tenancy prevailing in that particular area. Now we have got this Bill dealing with pannaiyals and tenants in Tanjore district. Are we to understand that the provisions of this Bill are to apply to all portions not covered by the Malabar Tenancy Act? Are there only two sets of conditions prevailing in this State, one set of conditions in Malabar and another set of conditions in the other areas? I think this clause 15 itself is unnecessary. For all the provisions of this Bill cannot be extended to the other parts of this State. Because conditions in other parts are totally different from the conditions prevailing in Tanjore district. The system of pannaiyals and the conditions of varam tenant are peculiar to Tanjore district. In Tiruchirappalli and Salem districts, we do not have such conditions. Therefore, I submit clause 15 itself may be omitted."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I oppose the amendment."

MR. SPEAKER:—"There is no amendment. (Laughter.) I shall now put the Government amendment to the vote of the House. The question is—

'In sub-clause (2), for the words "any modifications", substitute the words "such modifications" and for the words "they are so laid", substitute the words "it is so laid".'

The amendment was carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Mr. Rajagopala Rao's amendment is out of order. So I shall now put clause 15, as amended, to the vote of the House."

Clause 15, as amended, was put and carried.

[3rd December 1952]

Clause 16.

MR. SPEAKER :—" The motion is—

' That clause 16 do stand part of the Bill.' "

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the amendment that stands in my name may become unnecessary, if I just get certain clarifications. The purpose of my amendment is not to give delegated legislative powers to the Government. If I understand it aright, it is covered by sub-clause (2) of this clause where it is provided that—

' All rules made under this section after the 31st December 1952 shall be laid for not less than fourteen days before the Legislative Assembly of the State as soon as possible after they are made, and shall be subject to such modifications, whether by way of repeal or amendment, as that Assembly may make during the session in which they are so laid.'

Therefore, all rules that are made, automatically and normally, come before the Legislature and the Legislature will have its own say in the matter. The only snag about which I want some clarification is this, namely, that it is provided in the explanation under sub-section (2) that—

' This sub-section shall not apply to any rules made on or before the 31st December 1952.'

I want to know, whether in the interval between the date of coming into force of this Act and the date, 31st December 1952, if some rules are made, they will not normally come before the Legislature or am I to understand that there is no intention to make any rules as some rules have already been made under the Ordinance or whether the Government intend to make rules under this clause only after 31st December 1952 which would then normally come before the Legislature."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, I may explain that generally it is intended that the rules already made are enough, but it is likely that we may have to make a few more rules. For instance, I have just mentioned about the appearance of agents and others. It may be necessary to make a few more rules but they will not be of a substantial nature but they will be rules which are necessary to give administrative effect to the Bill itself. We should, therefore, be satisfied with the rules as they are because more rules can be made afterwards. When rules are being added afterwards, they will be discussed and, if any suggestion is made then that an old rule should be modified, it will also be attended to. On this assurance, I think, the hon. Member may rest satisfied."

SRI P. RANGASWAMI REDDIAR :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, there is already an Act called the Madras Buildings Lease and Rent Control Act. It was first enacted as an Order and then it was passed into an Act. I bring this comparison because the provisions in this Act are more or less similar in nature to the provisions in this Bill in regard to landlords and tenants. In the Rent Control Act there is a specific provision, that is section 9, enabling the Courts to execute orders and decrees passed, and I do not know why

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Rangaswami Reddiar]

in this Bill alone it has been delegated to the rule-making powers of the Government. I do not know what exactly is the object of the Government in not making a specific provision as part of the Bill itself for the execution or enforcement of any orders, decisions or awards passed under this Act or for the removal of any doubts or difficulties which may arise in giving effect to the provisions thereof.

"In this connection, I want to draw the attention of the Hon. Minister in charge to one other fact. The Prevention of Hindu Bigamy and Divorce Act came into force in May 1949 but the rules thereunder were framed in October or November 1951 and published in the *Port St. George Gazette* and nearly two and a half years elapsed between the date of coming into force of the Act and the date of rules thereunder being published in the Gazette. Meanwhile, in the course of these two and a half years, neither the courts nor the lawyers nor the parties were properly guided by any rules. I therefore submit that, instead of delegating the matter of execution and enforcement of orders and decisions passed by the Conciliation Officers and the Revenue Courts to the rule-making powers of the Government, a separate clause may be incorporated in the Bill itself."

* Sri VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ బిల్లు లోని clause 16 క్రింద రూల్సు తయారుచేసేటప్పుడు, యీ క్లాజులో ఉన్న ప్రకారంగా మార్పులు ఏమైనా ఉంటే శాసనసభలోనే యీ మార్పులు చేయ వలసియున్నదని ఉన్నది. మొదట గవర్నమెంటు draft rules శాసనసభ table మీద 14 దినములు పుంచవలెననిస్తే, ఆ తర్వాత వాటికి amendments లేకపోతే. అనుబంధానికి చేవచ్చుననే విషయములు తున్నవి. కాని ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పినట్లు “మీరు అందరు సభ్యులు ఇస్తే, ఆ రూల్సు drafts చేసేటప్పుడు చేర్చరావన్నారు. ఇక్కడ నాకు ఒక అనుమానం వచ్చింది. ఏమిటంటే draft rules, Assembly Table మీద 14 దినములు ఉంచినప్పుడు, ఆ తర్వాత వర్చకు అవకాశముంటుంది. లేకపోతే గవర్నమెంటుకు rule making powers క్రింద సభ్యులు వచ్చించ టానికి అవకాశము లేకపోవచ్చు. కాని notification వల్ల యీ రూల్సు publish చేయవచ్చును అని ఉన్నది. కాని మార్పులు ఏమైనావుంటే, అవి మార్పు టుంటుంటే హక్కు శాసనసభకు తున్నది. అప్పుడు అందరు రూల్సు revise చేయ వచ్చు. దీని విషయములూ ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు చెప్పినవిధంగా చేయకపోతే అనుమాన గ్రహంగా ఉంటుంది. కాబట్టి, దీనివిషయమై ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారు ఏమి సమాధానము చెప్పారని అడుగుతున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“The *Mukhya Mantri* is surprised that the hon. Gentleman, Sri Vavilala Gopala-krishnaiah, is more suspicious than even Sri P. Ramamurthi.”

(Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah stood up.)

MR. SPEAKER :—“The hon. Member has had his say and he cannot be allowed to speak a second time.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“Sir, sub-clause (2) of this clause also was introduced at our instance. I said at the time of

[Sri T. Viswanatham] [3rd December 1952]

the Select Committee and, I also repeat it now, that I appreciate the action of the Hon. the Chief Minister in accepting it. But, there is one point which the hon. Member, Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah, wanted the Hon. Chief Minister to clarify. In this connection, I may say that there are two or three methods of the Legislature exercising control over the executive. One method of exercising such control is to make a provision that every rule or notification which Government make should be placed on the table of the House and that it would take effect only after a certain time, that is, after giving an opportunity to any and every Member to move any amendments to those rules. This is the position in regard to clause 15. If a notification is made by the Government extending the operation of this Act to other areas, this clause lays down that this notification must be placed on the table of the House for fourteen days. During those fourteen days any Member will have the right to give notice of an amendment and, if so, the amendment will be brought for discussion as part of the Official Business. It will not be treated as non-official business because the procedure is so provided in the legislation itself. If no amendment has been received or, if the amendment had been considered and disposed of by the House, the notification will come into effect fourteen days after it was placed on the table of the House. The effect of sub-clause (2) in clause 16 is slightly different. In this sub-clause we have consented to give power to the Government to make rules and bring them into effect as soon as they are issued because it is presumed that they generally do not relate to essential matters. They will also be placed on the table of the House for fourteen days and during those fourteen days every Member will have the right to move amendments. Here again these amendments will be treated as part of the Official Business and we have every right to modify those rules. The rules made under clause 15 do not come into effect in the first instance itself, but only when the House has disposed of the matter and fourteen days after they are placed on the table of the House. In the second set of rules made under clause 16, they come into effect at once but can be modified by giving notice of amendments within fourteen days after they are placed on the table of the House. These are two methods of the legislature exercising control over the executive. Hitherto it was not the practice of the Government to make such provisions. We have been fighting for them and, particularly, I have been fighting for the inclusion of such provisions. I was glad that we succeeded in persuading the Hon. the Chief Minister to do this at the Select Committee stage itself and, I hope, that hereafter in the drafting of Bills, the Government will introduce clauses to this effect in regard to rules and notification."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has not followed the suggestions made by me regarding rules for delegated legislation. In the draft rules which have been sent to the Rules Committee Members, I have suggested that we should follow the Centre in this respect."

3rd December 1952]

SRI T. VISWANATHAM:—"I am very glad that the Hon. the Speaker has taken note of this matter."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall put clause 16 to the vote of the House."

Clause 16 was put and carried.

Clause 17.

MR. SPEAKER:—"As there are no amendments to this clause I propose to put the clause to vote." 12-30 p.m.

Clause 17 was put and carried.

THE SCHEDULE.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The motion is—

'The Schedule do stand part of the Bill.' "

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Mr. Speaker Sir, I beg to move the following amendment:—

'In the Schedule, omit the word "Wages" in line 1.'

Sir, the Schedule not only deals with wages but also with other ways of sharing of the produce. The heading 'Wages,' therefore, is misleading. I am, therefore, moving the above amendment."

SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Speaker Sir, may I know from the Government what is the object of omitting the word 'Wages'?"

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"I have only to explain that this Schedule is an agreement reached. It deals not only with wages but with maniams, manaikollais, etc. The word 'Wages' at the top of the Schedule is wrong and it should be removed. The law remains just as it is."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I suggest that some other heading like 'Schedule of Remuneration' may be adopted."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In the Schedule, omit the word "Wages" in line 1.' "

The amendment was carried.

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM:—"I beg to move—
'Omit sub-clause (2) (f).'

Sir, my amendment is a simple one and I think, the Hon. the Revenue Minister will accept it and will not oppose it as he is usually doing with amendments moved from this side. The object of the amendment is to see that the wages which a pannaial gets should not be restricted. Under sub-clause (f) of clause 2 each pannaial will get his share only on the yield from not more than one veli (6 $\frac{2}{3}$ acres) of land belonging to the mirasidar. In clause 2 of the Schedule it has been provided that for harvesting, kalavadi,

[Sri P. B. Rajachidambaram] [3rd December 1952]

chindumani, etc., pannaiyals will be paid 1/7th of the gross produce on the plots on which they have worked as pannaiyals. I should like to know why a pannaiyal should get his share only on the yield from one veli of land alone? Suppose a pannaiyal is clever, hard-working, etc., and wants to work on more than one veli, why should such a person be prevented from working on more than one veli. I request the Government to accept my amendment."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, I expected the hon. Member Sri Rajachidambaram to help us. Instead, I am afraid, he is suggesting something which would make the thing go wrong. I shall explain. It is not generally the practice that plots are divided off for pannaiyals. There may be two or three or four pannaiyals working on a piece of land and they may be working generally more or less in co-operation and it would therefore not be easy always to find out the plot on which a particular pannaiyal has worked, but no one should be deprived of his proper share. There was a normal appraisement as to the size of land which a pannaiyal and his family could look after. That was why this agreement was reached at Mayuram and it was a sensible agreement. It provides two conditions. One is that he shall have to work actually on the plot of land and the other is that he shall not in any case be denied his remuneration. It was thought that there should be no room for claiming that a person worked on an impossible area. That is why these two limits are there. In view of the existing circumstances it would not be right for us now to tamper with the agreement already reached."

MR. SPEAKER :—" May I take it that the hon. Member Sri Rajachidambaram is not pressing his amendment."

SRI P. B. K. RAJACHIDAMBARAM :—" I am not pressing my amendment, Sir."

The amendment was by leave of the House withdrawn.

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, what about my general amendment? "

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, I am afraid that the amendment is out of order."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member cannot move such an amendment."

SRI Y. V. KRISHNA RAO :—" Mr. Speaker Sir, on a point of information. The Assembly passed clause 8 with all its amendments. I have now received notice of amendment given by the Hon. the Revenue Minister for clause 8, sub-clause (2). Is it right, Sir, for the Government to go on giving notice of amendments like this? "

MR. SPEAKER :—" They are only verbal amendments intended to correct grammatical mistakes."

3rd December 1952]

* SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—"Mr. Speaker Sir, there seems to be some defect in clause (1) of the Schedule. The Government's intention according to this clause is that every pannaiyal will be paid daily wages at one marakkal and every woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal. But the wording of the clause, as it is, shows that the entire body of pannaiyals working under a mirasidar will only get one marakkal. If the intention of the Government is that each pannaiyal should be paid daily wages at one marakkal and each woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal, the wording of this clause should be changed. It should be stated in the clause that each pannaiyal will get daily wages at so many marakkals, and that each woman labourer will get daily wages at so many marakkals. If this is not stated clearly, the landowner may say that all the pannaiyals employed by him will get only one marakkal. I am certain that such a thing is not intended by the Government."

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"We have not invented this clause. We have only reproduced the Mayuram Award as a Schedule. The meaning of the clause is quite clear; each pannaiyal will be paid daily wages at one marakkal and each woman labourer at $\frac{3}{4}$ marakkal."

SRI P. S. KRISHNASWAMI AYYANGAR:—"Why not we make a slight verbal alteration to make the position clear?"

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"We do not want to tamper with the Mayuram Award. We want to reproduce it as it is."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Now that it has been clearly stated in the House what is intended, we may not change the wording of the agreement reached. The matter has been explained on the floor of the House and that should be enough."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I shall put the Schedule as amended to the vote of the House."

The Schedule as amended was put and carried.

Clause 1.

MR. SPEAKER:—"Now, we will go back to the Short Title and the Preamble to the Bill. First, we shall take up the Short Title. Regarding that, hon. Members have given notice of certain amendments for enlarging the scope of the Bill. I wish to inform hon. Members that if they want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, they cannot do so at this stage. I am therefore ruling all the amendments out of order." 12-40 p.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"I would like to make one submission in this connection and that is, it was because we anticipated that some such thing will happen . . ."

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—Even if the amendments had been brought forward at an earlier stage, I would have ruled them out of order. The hon. Member is new to the procedure of the Assembly and I would advise him to consult the Leader of the Opposition in regard to the matter. Even if the Government want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, what they should do is, they must withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill. That is why in the case of the other Bill, namely, the Motor Vehicles Bill, I advised the Government to withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill because the Select Committee had no right to enlarge the scope of the Bill.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ Mr. Speaker, it is one thing for the Government to come forward with a Bill and another thing to enlarge the scope of a Bill which they themselves have proposed. Whatever might be the powers of the Government, I submit, this House, as a sovereign body, has always got the right to enlarge the scope of a Bill. We are a sovereign body and if we feel that a particular Bill must be enlarged, or for the matter of that, this particular Bill must be applied throughout the State, the House has got a right to take it up.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ There are methods by which they can do that and the parliamentary method of doing it is to withdraw the Bill and bring in a fresh Bill. Whether the Government do that or the hon. Members do that, I have no objection to that.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ The point is this, Sir. We know the difficulties of non-official members and the non-official side of this House has not got equal opportunities with the Government. Of course, there are so many methods. We ourselves can bring forward a Bill and when the Government bring forward a Bill we, as a sovereign body, can change the scope of the Bill. It is, of course, open to the House to accept it or not.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ If the Government want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, as I said, they will have to bring in a fresh Bill.”

THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ The Speaker regulates the procedure in a sovereign body.”

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—“ What I want to submit to the Speaker is that we need not copy all that is being done in England. We can set our own traditions and settle our own precedents and we have got sufficient genius in the country to settle our own traditions and precedents. If we think that in the interests of all, it is necessary and expedient to discuss a particular Bill and the House itself agrees to the enlargement of the scope of the Bill, then nothing can stand in the way. Simply because a particular procedure is followed in the British Parliament, I do not think, we should be bound by that procedure.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ All Legislatures follow this procedure. If the hon. Member wants we can change this rule also. But till that is done, we will have to follow the existing procedure.”

3rd December 1952]

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Where are the rules saying that we cannot change the scope of the Bill?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"If the hon. Member wants he can speak on the clause."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Sir, in view of the large number of amendments proposed and rejected by the House I am sure that hon. Members will not propose extending this Bill to all parts of the State without very much more consideration. So, I do not think they will move the amendments at all even if permitted."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI:—"Permit and then see."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అధ్యక్షా, ఇక్కడ ఒక చిన్న విషయమున్నది. ఈ బిల్లు ప్రారంభములోనే దీనిని తీసుకోవలసినదని మేము చెప్పాము."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The hon. Member can speak in English at least for my sake."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"మేము ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొనినపుడు ప్రారంభంలో దీని title తీసుకోవలసిందని చెప్పాము. దానిని మొదట తీసుకొన్నట్లయితే, బిల్లును ఆ ప్రకారంగా మార్చడానికి అవకాశముంటుంది. అందుచేతనే మొట్టమొదట title ను, మొదటి క్లాజును తీసుకోవడం చాలా ముఖ్యమని, దాని ప్రాధాన్యతను గుర్తించే మేము ఆ విధంగా proceed కావాలని చెప్పాము. కాని, సాధారణంగా Parliamentary సాంప్రదాయాన్ని బట్టి మిగత క్లాజులన్నీ తీసుకొనిన తరువాతనే, title గాని, మొదటి క్లాజుగాని తీసుకోవలసియుంటుందని అభిప్రాయపడి ఆ విధంగానే ఇప్పుడు చేశారు. ఇదివరకు జరిగిన చర్చలలో, ఇతర క్లాజులన్నీ accept చేస్తు వచ్చాము. ఇప్పుడు చివరకు ఈ title కు మొదటి క్లాజుకు వచ్చాము. ఈ ఆనెంట్టి ఇప్పుడున్నటువంటి బిల్లును ఈ మాసములో మొత్తము రాష్ట్రమంతట వర్తింపచేయ దలచుకొన్నట్లయితే, ఇప్పుడు ఆ విధంగా చేసేందుకు ఆనెంట్టికి అధికారమున్నదా, లేదా ఆనెట్టువంటి point of order వచ్చినప్పుడు, దానికి మీరు రూలింగ్ ఇచ్చేటప్పుడు, ఈ ఆనెంట్టికి ఈమాత్రము అధికారం లేకపోతే, ఇంక ఏదీ ఉన్న అధికారమేమిటి, ఆనెట్టువంటి విషయాన్ని మీరు తరచిదూచి order ఇవ్వాలని కోరుతున్నాను."

MR. SPEAKER:—"I have heard enough of discussion on this matter and I am going to give my ruling straightaway. This Tanjore Ordinance was issued long ago and this Bill is the outcome of that Ordinance."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"ఈ బిల్లును extend చేయకూడదని ఎక్కడైనా rules ఉన్నవా?"

MR. SPEAKER:—"According to parliamentary practice, if they want to enlarge the scope of the Bill, they should withdraw it. If the Government want they can withdraw it and bring in a fresh Bill."

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—"అందుచేతనే మేము మొట్టమొదటనే ఈ title ను వర్చిస్తామని చెప్పాము. అమాదిరి జరిగియుంటే, అప్పుడు ఇది vito అయ్యేదో లేక కొత్తగా తయారై ఉండేదో తేలిపోయి ఉండేది."

[3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is new to the House and if he listens to Mr. Viswanatham's advice, he will be convinced."

* THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" In any case, I would say for the information of Mr. Nagi Reddi that it does not matter whether this clause is taken up first or later on. But the only point is whether we can extend the scope of the Bill. The accepted convention and the rule is that it is not open to the House to extend the scope of the Bill by way of amendment. That is the recognized principle. On the other hand, if it is intended to extend the scope of the Bill, the only thing that can be done is to withdraw the Bill and bring in another Bill. If the House feels that this Bill is not sufficient and that some other Bill with wider scope should be brought in, the only course open to the House is to throw out this Bill. It is not as if we are blindly following the British Parliament, but we are following a practice so that the business of the House can be got through properly and expeditiously. Therefore, when once we want to extend the scope of the Bill, all sorts of things will come in and we will not be able to transact the business of the House. That is why this Bill has been prepared with a limited scope. If that is not acceptable, it is always open to the House to throw it out and force the Government to bring in another Bill with an extended scope."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Now the motion before the House is that clause 1, ' Short Title and Commencement ' do stand part of the Bill. I will allow speeches on this motion."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" On a point of order, Sir, ' In clause 15 it is stated " in any neighbouring area outside the Tanjore district . . . " "

అని ఈ విధంగా ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకునూడ ఈ బిల్లిను extend చేయవచ్చునని ఖచ్చితంగా అందులో ఉన్నది. దీంతో Tanjore జిల్లా బయట ప్రక్కన ఉన్నటువంటి జిల్లాలకునూడ దీనిని extend చేసేందుకు ఒక మార్గము ఏర్పాటు చేయబడినది."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Then it is a wrong interpretation."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—" మీరు చెప్పింది మేము ఓప్పుకొంటాము. అయితే, దీంతో outside the Tanjore district అని clear గా చెప్పబడినది. కనుక దీనిని ఇతర చోట్లకు extend చేయడానికి వట్టి రీత్యాకూడా ఇది అవకాశమిస్తున్నది. ప్రభుత్వము ఈ విధంగా చేయడానికి ఈ క్లాజు అవకాశమిస్తున్నది. అందువల్ల దీనిని రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తించేటట్లు amendment move చేయడానికి ఇప్పుడు అవకాశమున్నది. కనుక ఆ ప్రకారము దీనిని సవరించి రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తించేటట్లు చేయవలసిందని కోరుతున్నాను."

12-50
p.m.

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" Sir, the hon. Member has not spoken on the motion before the House. He has spoken on the amendment which has been ruled out of order."

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—" To be fair to Mr. Venkateswarlu, I must say that he was only making a request to the Chair to reconsider the ruling and he was not disputing the ruling."

3rd December 1952]

MR. SPEAKER:—"I think he said that the scope could be enlarged so as to make the Bill applicable to the whole State because sub-clause (2) of clause 1 said *inter alia* that the Act shall come into force in any other area in the adjoining districts in the State of Madras. I think he is giving a wrong interpretation."

SRI PILLALAMARRI VENKATESWARLU :—"అధ్యక్ష, ఒక విధంగా ఇదిచాలా ముఖ్యమైనటువంటి బిల్లు. దీని విషయమై మీరు రూలింగు ఇచ్చారు. మీ రూలింగు ననుసరించి చూస్తుంటున్నాను. ప్రభుత్వము ఈ బిల్లును ఎప్పుడైతే ప్రకటిస్తుందో, రాష్ట్రమునకు అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో పెద్ద పెద్ద ఘాస్వాములు కొలు దార్లను ఘాములనుండి తొలగించడం జరుగుతుందనే విషయాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము దృష్టికి తీసుకువచ్చాము. కాని ఈ రోజున దీనిని సవరించడానికి ఆవశ్యకము లేదంటున్నారు. అయితే దీని ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపములో ఇట్లాగే వదలిపెట్టినట్లయితే, అనగా, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని సమస్యలను పరిష్కారించేయకుండా, ఈ చట్టాన్ని ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపములో ప్రవేశపెట్టినట్లయితే, ఘాస్వాములు కొలుదార్లను తప్పకుండా ఘాములనుండి తొలగించి, ఆ ఘాములను పంచాయితీగా వారి స్వాధీనం చేసుకోవడం జరుగుతుంది. ఉదాహరణకు నా నియోజకవర్గములో ముత్యాలరాజు అనే ఘాస్వామి తన ఘాముల నన్నింటిని స్వంతకమతానికి తీసుకొని చాలా కాలముగా పనిచేస్తున్నటువంటి రైతులను తొలగించి, ఆ ఘాములను ఆక్రమింపడం జరుగుతుంది. ఇటువంటి దారుణమైన పరిస్థితులు సంభవిస్తున్నాయి. ఈ విషయము గురించి మురైగారికి కలెక్టరుకు ఎంతోమంది చెప్పినప్పటికీ లాభము లేకపోయింది. ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి కిష్టపరిస్థితులు విస్తరించినాయి, కనుక అక్కడనే దీనిని వర్తింప చేస్తున్నాము అని ప్రభుత్వము చెప్పడం సరియైనదికాదు. వల్లదు తాలూకాలో చూచినట్లయితే, అక్కడ ఉన్న దారుణపరిస్థితులలో రైతులు జైళ్ళకు పోవడంకూడ జరుగుతుంది. కనుక నేను ప్రభుత్వానికి మనవిచేస్తున్నది ఏమంటే ప్రభుత్వము కనుక ఈ బిల్లును ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు extend చేయకుండా ఇప్పుడున్న రూపములోనే అమలుజరిపినట్లయితే, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని పెద్ద పెద్ద ఘాస్వాములు తమ ఘాముల నుండి తప్పకుండా రైతులను తొలగిస్తారు, అనేక తగాదాలు, ఘర్షణలు బయలుదేరుతాయి. రైతులు నానావస్థలు పడుతారు. అప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము, కమ్యూనిస్టు లేదో గందరగోళము చేసినారు. అందుకే ఇటువంటి తగాదాలు వచ్చాయని అనడం సరికాదు. ఆ కారణము ఏ విధంగానూ ఒప్పుకోలేకపోయింది. కనుక అలాంటి కిష్టపరిస్థితులు, తగాదాలు ఏవి కలుగకుండునట్లు, ఇప్పుడే దీనిని అన్ని ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింప చేయవలసియింటుందని తెలియచేస్తున్నాను. చాలా జమీందారీ areas లో, కళా వెంకటరావు ధర్మమా అన్నట్టు వారి జమీందారీ వట్టుకుద్వారా, చాలామంది అసాములు ఘాస్వాములుగా తయారైనారు. అటువంటి ప్రాంతాలలో అంతాగూడాను రైతులు ఎక్కవ చెబ్బి తినవలసివస్తుంది. అందువల్ల ఈ బిల్లును ఒక్క Tanjore జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేసినట్లయితే, ఇతరచోట్ల చాలా దారుణపరిస్థితులు సంభవించినప్పుడు, తగాదాలు విపరీతమైనప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము పోలీసులను తుపాకులతో సిద్ధము కల్పింతుంది. ఇది అందరికీ తెలిసినవిషయమే. కనుక అటువంటి పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడకుండా, ప్రభుత్వము ఈ చట్టాన్ని అంతటా వర్తింపజేయవలసిందని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి విజ్ఞప్తి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లును ఇప్పటివరకువచ్చామునే ప్రవేశపెట్టినట్లయితే, చాలామంది tenants చాలా యిబ్బందులు పడుతారనే విషయాన్ని రాజగోపాలాచారిగారికి తెలియజేస్తున్నాను. కనుక దీనిని వారు పునరాలోచించి తగు మైన రీతి సవరించవచ్చునని తెలిజేస్తున్నాను."

[3rd December 1952]

SRI T. NAGI REDDI:—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లు వి పరిస్థితులలో ఈ నాడు amendment చర్చకు వచ్చినదో, ఆ పరిస్థితులనుంచి మనము బయటపడడానికి ఈ బిల్లు ఉపయోగపడుతున్నదా అనేటటువంటి విషయాన్ని మనము చాలా జాగ్రత్తగా విచారించాలి. ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రములో ఉన్న పరిస్థితులు విమిటి, రాష్ట్ర మొత్తము మీద ప్రమాదమైన ఆర్థిక దుస్థితిమూలంగా ఎక్స్‌చిక్యూటును ఎదుర్కొంటున్న సమయములో వచ్చినటువంటి బిల్లు ఇదియని గమనించవలసియైనది. ఒక్క తంజావూరులోనే అక్కడి ఘాస్యాములకు, కౌలుదార్లకు మధ్య వచ్చినటువంటి తగాదాలమూలంగానే ఈ బిల్లు అక్కడికి వచ్చినది అనుకొనడం ఎంత ప్రధానమైనప్పటికీ, ఈనాడు రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద ఉన్నటువంటి ఆర్థిక దుస్థితినుంచి వివిధంగా బయటపడడమూ అనే ఆలోచనతో, ఆ దుస్థితినుంచి బయటపడడానికి ప్రభుత్వము మార్గాలు అన్వేషిస్తూ ఇటువంటి బిల్లు తీసుకొనిరావడం ఇది ఒక మార్గమని దీనిని తీసుకొనివచ్చినది. ఈ నాడు దేశములో పరిస్థితి ఎట్లా ఉన్నది అని చూచినట్లయితే, గ్రామస్థులలో ప్రజానీకానికి తినడానికి తిండి, కట్టుకోడానికి గుడ్డ లేకుండా వారి కొనుగోలు శక్తి నశించినది. రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద, ఇప్పుడు ఒక్క పారిశ్రామికీకరణకాక, వ్యవసాయదారులకేగాక, మధ్యతరగతి ప్రజలందరికీ, అన్ని చోట్లాకూడా ఈ దుస్థితి పెరిగిపోయింది. ఈసందర్భములో మనము ఈ economic crisis నుంచి బయటపడడానికి మార్గము విమిటి అని ఆలోచించాలి. దీని కొరకు మనము చేసేత గుడ్డలు కొనండి అని ప్రజకు చెప్పినంత మాత్రానగాని, లేక, మధ్యతరగతి ప్రజలను కష్టపడి పనిచేయాలి అని చెప్పినంత మాత్రానగాని, లేక ఘాస్యాములకు కౌలుదార్లకు మధ్య సన్నిహితమైన స్నేహము, సౌభ్రాతృత్వము, ప్రేమ పూర్వకమైన సంబంధాలు ఉండాలి అని అన్నంత మాత్రాన ఈ దుస్థితినుంచి బయట పడడం అసంభవము నేటటువంటి విషయము ఈ నాడు అందరికీ తెలుసును. కాబట్టి ఈ దుస్థితినుండి వివిధంగా అయిన తప్పించుకోవడానికి ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొని రాబడినప్పుడు, ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యమేమిటి. అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి వివిధ వర్గాల మధ్య వచ్చినటువంటికష్ట పరిస్థితులనుంచి కొద్దిగా, తాత్కాలికంగా అయినా సరే, బయట పడడానికిని రెండవది ఈనాడున్నటువంటి ఆర్థికదుస్థితినుంచి మనను రక్షించుకోవడానికి ఈ బిల్లు చేపడింది అంటే అందులో సందేహములేదు. కనుక ఈ బిల్లులో ఉన్నటువంటి ప్రాధాన్యత విమిటంబే, మొట్టమొదటి సారిగా మన రాష్ట్రములో ప్రభుత్వము ఈ ఘాస్యాములకు కౌలుదార్లకు మధ్యన ఉన్నటువంటి తగాదాలను తొలగించడం చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిదని గుర్తించింది. ఈ నాడు కౌలుదార్లకు అన్యాయము జరుగుచున్నదని ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించి, ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయని ప్రభుత్వము అభిప్రాయపడుచున్నప్పుడు మేము ఈ వైపునుంచి ఈ పరిస్థితులు రాష్ట్రంలో అన్నిచోట్లకూడ ఉన్నాయని కనుక ఈ బిల్లును రాష్ట్రము మొత్తమీద వర్తింపజేయాలని, తదనుగుణంగా సవరణలు తీసుకురావలసి మేము ప్రయత్నాలు చేశాము. కాని ఇక్కడున్నటువంటి (procedure, rules) ప్రకారము చూకు అది సాధ్యముకాక పోయినందుకు చాలా విచారిస్తున్నాము. ఇదివరకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రశ్నితరముల కాలములో, ఈ బిల్లును ఇతర చోట్ల కూడ వర్తింప జేయటకు ప్రయత్నము చేస్తున్నాము, త్వరలోనే చేస్తాము, అటువంటి రిపోర్టుకూడ మావద్దకు వచ్చినది, దాని పరిశీలన అయిన శరువాత దీనికి పూనుకొంటామని (Land Revenue) మంత్రిగారు చెప్పారు. ఈ బిల్లు చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిదనే సందర్భములో నేను వారికి కొన్ని సూచనలు చేయదలచాను. ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క scope) ఇంక ఎక్కువగా ఉండాలి అని కోరుతున్నప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము అందుకు ఒప్పుకో

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Nagi Reddi]

లేదు. ప్రస్తుతము తంజావూరులోని క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులే దీనికి కారణమని చెప్పారు. కాని ఈ నాడు మనము ఈ ఆర్థిక దుస్థితినుంచి బయట పడడానికి ప్రజలలో కొనుగోలు శక్తి ఎక్కువ చేయాలంటే, ప్రజల ఎంత కష్టపడి తని చేస్తున్నారో ఆ కష్టానికి సగటునంటి ఫలిత ముండా అనే దానికనుగుణంగా ఒక బిల్లును తీసుకురావాలి. అప్పుడే ప్రజలయొక్క కొనుగోలుశక్తి పెరుగుతుంది. ఈ సందర్భములో కొన్ని సూచనలుచేస్తూ సుబ్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీ వారిచ్చినటువంటి రిపోర్టును (general) గా ప్రభుత్వము ఒప్పక పోయినందుకు నేను చాలా విచారిస్తున్నాను. ప్రస్తుత పరిస్థితులలో ఈ బిల్లుగురించి మేము, దీనిని ఇతరత్రాకూడ వ్యాపింప చేయాలని కోరగా, ఈ విషయాన్ని పరిశీలిస్తున్నాము. త్వరలో చేయబోతామని హామీ ఇచ్చినది కాబట్టి దీనిని త్వరలో ఇతర చోట్లకు కూడ తీసుకొని వస్తారని అనుకొంటున్నాను. లేక పోయినట్లయితే ఇతర జిల్లాలలో దారుణమైన పరిస్థితులు సంభవిస్తాయి. రైతులు అనేక ఇబ్బందులకు గురి అవుతారు. ఎన్నో తగాదాలు ఏర్పడుతుంటాయి. కనుక అటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు వచ్చేవరకు ఊరక యుండి, అవి ఏర్పడిన తరువాత ఆ మంటలన్నీ ఒకేసారి ఆపరామంటే, అప్పుడు రైతులకు, తీరిన నష్టము సంభవించి యుంటుంది. కనుక అటువంటి పరిస్థితులు రాకముందే, దీనిని ఇతర చోట్లకు వర్తింప చేసేందుకు ప్రభుత్వము ప్రయత్నించవలెనని కోరుచున్నాను.”

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—“ Sir, I did not wish to interrupt Mr. Nagi Reddi. Both Mr. Venkateswarlu and Mr. Nagi Reddi spoke as if the motion before the House were that the Bill be passed into law. They made general observations which had nothing to do with the clause 1 that is before the House.”

SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ The position is that their remarks are applicable to the third reading stage also.”

* RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, I shall confine my remarks to the limit set down by the Hon. Chief Minister. The motion before the House relates to Short Title and commencement. I shall not take up the time of the House with reference to the Short Title. But with regard to commencement, I should like to say a few words. It has been argued that this Bill should apply to all parts of the State. The conditions in all parts of the State are not all alike. The extension of this Bill may not suit the conditions in many parts of the State, unless several clauses are modified and new clauses introduced. In taking power to extend the Bill to certain other areas, the Government have been careful and wise enough to use the words ‘ in any other area in the adjoining districts ’ in contrast to the words ‘ in any other area in the outside districts. ’ The use of ‘ outside districts ’ may mean that the Government may skip over one or two districts. But that is not the intention of the Bill. Conditions may be similar in adjoining areas like the Chidambaram taluk of the South Arcot district, and Tiruchirappalli district. Even within the Tanjore district, the tenants in certain areas only will be benefited by this Bill, as in the other areas the tenants are getting more from the landlord than what this Bill provides for. Sri Venkateswarlu does not know as much about Tanjore as I know.

[Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad] [3rd December 1952]

I know several hundreds of instances where the pannaiyal or tenant wants the present practice to continue in preference to what is provided for in the Bill. I am not at all saying that the Bill should oust the present custom or practice if that is better and conducive to cordial relationship between the landlord and the tenant. I shall not discuss the general principles of the Bill, as we can discuss them in the third reading stage which will come up in the afternoon. With regard to the area of the application of this Act, I wish to say that it is better to watch the working of this Bill in the Tanjore district, study the reactions, and remedy the defects before extending it to other areas. We have got to deal with an enormous number of Conciliation Officers and Revenue Courts, we have got to see how their judgments are implemented and what the tenant-landlord relationship is going to be in the future. All of us are interested in more production and it is no use talking of more production without the co-operation of the landlord. It is well known that the pannaiyal or tenant has not got the wherewithal for carrying out agricultural operations. That being so, let us pray for the success of this Bill in the Tanjore district to which it is confined, with all the goodwill of this House and the good intentions of the Government. I am very glad that the Hon. Chief Minister and the Hon. Revenue Minister limited the scope of this Bill to Tanjore district. If the Government want to extend this Bill to other parts of the State, they should extend it very carefully. I would request them not to extend this Bill by notification. If they want to apply the principles underlying this Bill to Rayalaseema or the other Andhra districts or the southern districts like Tirunelveli, Madurai and Ramanathapuram, I would request them to bring in a separate legislation. Two-thirds of Ramanathapuram district is zamindari area belonging to the Raja of Ramanathapuram and the Zamindar of Sivaganga. When the zamindaris were there, the tenants were getting fifty per cent of the produce. After their conversion into ryotwari area, the ryotwari pattadars also are giving the tenants fifty per cent of the produce. I am pleading for giving fifty per cent to the tenant. Mr. Venkateswarlu is aghast at my pleading and it takes his breath away. Instead of extending this Bill by notification and discussing the notification on the floor of this House, we can bring in a new legislation and discuss it. It is quite possible that the working of this Bill in Tanjore may have the effect of making the landlords and tenants in the other districts to settle among themselves amicably and it may not be necessary to bring in any new legislation at all. While I am not against legislation for the other parts of the State, I only want that the legislation should take due note of the custom prevailing in each area.

“Finally, I congratulate the Government on the very wise step they have taken in bringing forward this measure. Let us wish all good luck to the Government in carrying out this measure successfully in the Tanjore district.”

MR. SPEAKER:—“I wish to remind the House that the hon. Members have another opportunity of saying what they have

3rd December 1952] [Mr. Speaker]

got to say on the Bill at the third reading stage, I shall put clause 1 to the vote of the House."

Clause 1 was put and carried.

The Preamble was put and carried.

MR. SPEAKER:—"The Government have given notice of some verbal amendments. Let the Hon. Minister for Revenue move them."

Clause 2.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move—

'In clause 2, letter the last paragraph as sub-clause (m) and for the initial word "All" substitute the word "all".'"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In clause 2, letter the last paragraph as sub-clause (m) and for the initial word "All" substitute the word "all".'"

The amendment was carried.

Clause 6.

Sub-clause (2).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move—

'For the words "be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" substitute the words "on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'"

This amendment only puts the clause in the proper form."

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'For the words "be entitled to apply to the Conciliation Officer" substitute the words "on application made to the Conciliation Officer, be entitled".'"

The amendment was carried.

Clause 7.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER:—"Sir, I move— 1-10 p.m.

'In sub-clause (c) omit the word "and" occurring after the word "fertilisers".'"

MR. SPEAKER:—"The question is—

'In sub-clause (c) omit the word "and" occurring after the word "fertilisers".'"

The amendment was carried.

[3rd December 1952]

Clause 8.

Sub-clause (2).

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' After the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' After the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

The amendment was carried.

Clause 12.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' In sub-clause (3), for the words " to all the rights " substitute the words " in all the rights " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (3), for the words " to all the rights " substitute the words " in all the rights " . '

The amendment was carried.

Clause 13.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' In sub-clause (1) second paragraph, after the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (1) second paragraph, after the words " tenancy provides for any rent ", insert the words " and not for the sharing of the actual produce raised " . '

The amendment was carried.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' In sub-clause (4) omit the word " the " occurring before " Madras Ordinance IV of 1952 " . '

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In sub-clause (4) omit the word " the " occurring before " Madras Ordinance IV of 1952 " . '

The amendment was carried.

3rd December 1952]

Clause 14.

THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' In the last line for the words " its scope " substitute the words " its or his scope " . '

The court can be called ' it ', but a conciliation officer cannot be called ' it ', and hence this amendment."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The question is—

' In the last line for the words " its scope " substitute the words " its or his scope " . '

The amendment was carried.

* THE HON. SRI M. A. MANICKAVELU NAICKER :—" Sir, I move—

' That the Bill, as amended, be passed into law. '

Let me thank all hon. Members for their co-operation and criticisms on this Bill. I thank not only the Members who took part in the debate but also other hon. Members who, though they did not take part in the discussion, have intelligently followed the debate and have voted on the various clauses and amendments. A criticism was levelled that this Bill did not cover the whole State but it was restricted to Tanjore district. It is so because it was rather urgent that some legislation should be brought forward for that district. There was already a sort of agreement between the landholders and tenants in that district which was crystallised in the Mayuram Agreement. So, we had a starting point on which we could proceed. It is not so in the case of other districts. Hon. Members asked why this Bill should not be extended to other districts. I may tell them that only districts adjoining Tanjore can come under the purview of this Bill. Other districts cannot come. I am as anxious as other hon. Members are, regarding the plight of the tenants in districts other than Tanjore. This is a subject for separate consideration. We have not forgotten other districts. We are as much alive to the situation in other districts as hon. Members are. Under the parliamentary system, Opposition Members are at liberty to suggest, elaborate and far-reaching reforms. But the Government have to examine them and formulate cautiously. Even to a small Bill like this, which is applicable to only one district, there had been so much of opposition and criticism. How much more will be the opposition to a Bill which will be applicable to all the districts? I am so full of the discussion that has been going on that I have no time to think clearly of the potentialities of this Bill. Therefore, I do not want to expatiate on this Bill. I am not a believer in talk. I am a believer in actual results. Let us all hope that this Bill will bring about that result which we all desire. Let us bless this Bill, and let us hope that the relations between the landholders and the tenants will hereafter be as good and cordial as they were in bygone days.

[Sri M. A. Manickavelu Naicker] [3rd December 1952]

We shall hope that there will be a greater production in that district from now. Sir, I request hon. Members to pass this Bill unanimously."

MR. SPEAKER :—" I must tell the House that the Madras Land Revenue (Surcharge) Bill, 1952, and the Madras Motor Vehicles (Taxation of Passengers and Goods) Bill, 1952, were before the House for a very long time. I have allowed enough time for the hon. Members to give notice of amendments. I have already received hundreds of amendments. No more time will be allowed to hon. Members. If any hon. Member wishes to give notice of amendments, he must do so before 3 p.m. to-day. Now the motion before the House is—

' That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952 (L.A. Bill No. 12 of 1952), as amended, be passed into law."

* RAJA MUTHIAH CHETTIYAR OF CHETTINAD :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. Minister, belonging to the party to which I have the honour to belong, has moved that the Bill, as amended, be passed into law. The hon. Member Mr. Venkateswarlu need not think that I am opposed to this Bill. Sir, I am standing here only to give my fullest support to the Bill. (Sri T. Nagi Reddi: ' As a Congressman? ') I am really a Congressman. The hon. Member is not a Congressman. Both are true. The question of agrarian reforms has been engaging the attention of the politicians of South India for a long time. I am glad that we have not copied agrarian legislations in other States without reference to our own conditions in this State. I should like to congratulate the Hon. the Chief Minister and Hon. the Revenue Minister on their not having copied the Bombay scheme or any other scheme. They have brought forward a Bill which would suit our requirements.

1-20
p.m. " As regards the agrarian disturbances in the Tanjore district, nobody regrets them more than I. I shall not go into the causes of the disturbances. Let us only hope that this legislation will give the quietus to the disturbances and that this will not give any occasion for any people to disturb hereafter the peace and tranquillity of the place which is essential for increased production. Everybody in this country, right from the Prime Minister of India down to the villager, is anxious to increase production, particularly of rice. It will not be possible to increase production if these tenants and pannaiyals do not co-operate with each other in the Tanjore district. As regards the co-operation on the part of the landowners, I can say—though I do not own any land in the Tanjore district—on behalf of the people who are owning lands in that district, that they have been equally anxious to foster the best relationship between themselves and the tenants on the one hand and the tenants and the pannaiyals on the other. As I have already said, the terms and conditions on which the tenants and the pannaiyals are working in some places are more favourable than those provided in the Bill itself. In fact, in some places where terms and conditions provided in this Bill are sought to be imposed,

3rd December 1952] [Raja Muthiah Chettiyar of Chettinad]

the tenants and pannaiyals do not like them but want the old conditions to continue. Therefore, persons, who have not been able to see eye to eye with all the provisions of the Bill, can have the consolation that the tenants and pannaiyals are not over-anxious about these provisions. Anyway, we are glad that we are giving statutory recognition to the rights and privileges of the tenants and pannaiyals. Let us only hope that they will also co-operate with each other and increase production.

"The Bill is necessary not merely for giving security of tenure to the pannaiyals and the tenants but also for giving the quietus to the disturbances in Tanjore. It is from that standpoint that I welcome this Bill and congratulate the Government on the wise step that they have taken. With reference to the agrarian situation in other parts of the State, I shall only repeat my request that in course of time the Government may consider the enactment of a legislation to suit particular areas. Let us hope that in the coming years rice production will go up to a considerable extent in this area in particular."

* SRI VAVILALA GOPALAKRISHNAIAH :—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ బిల్లులో కొన్ని లోపములున్నప్పటికీ దీనియొక్క ముఖ్యద్దేశాన్ని గమనించి మొట్టమొదటిసారిగా ఇటువంటి బిల్లును ప్రభుత్వము తీసుకొని వచ్చినందుకు వారిని అభినందిస్తున్నాను. అయితే ఆ అభినందనను పూర్తిగా ఇవ్వలేక పోతున్నందుకు పిచారమున్నాను. తారణమేమిటంటే మద్రాసు రాష్ట్రములో, మొత్తంగా అన్నిచోట్ల ఖాస్సాములకు రైతులకు ఆనేక విధమైనటువంటి వివాదాలు, జరుగుతున్నప్పటికీ, వాటిని గుర్తించకుండా, ఒక్క తంజావూరులోనే ఈ క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయని అక్కడ మాత్రమే దీనిని వర్తింప జేయుట సరియైంది కాదు. ఉదాహరణకు ఒక విషయము చెప్పుచున్నాను సత్తెనపల్లి తాలూకాలో వడపల్లి గ్రామములో వంద సంవత్సరాలనుంచి పాలము దున్నుతున్నటువంటి రైతులను వారు ఖాస్సాములకు వ్యతిరేకంగా నడచుకొంటున్నారనే తారణంచేత ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అండగా పెట్టుకొని మూడువందల రైతాంగాన్ని పాలము నుండి తొలగించుటకు మూడు మాసములు వారి మధ్య పెవారా పెవారీగా పోరాటము జరిగింది. ప్రభుత్వము అండ తోటి ఆ రైతులను ఈనాడు పాలమినుండి వెళ్లగొట్టడము జరిగింది. ఆ ప్రకారము వంద సంవత్సరాలుగా ఆ పాలములో పని చేస్తున్నప్పటికీ కూడా, ఈ నాడు ఈ పాలము, మాదికాదు అని బయటికి వెళ్లవలసిన పరిస్థితి ఏర్పడింది కనుక ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోనే ఇటువంటి క్లిష్ట పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడినాయి, కనుక అక్కడే దీనిని అమలుజరుపుతున్నాము అని అనుకోవడం చాలా పొరపాటు. ఈ బిల్లును గనుక ఈ రూపములో అమలు పెట్టినట్లయితే, తప్పక ఇతర చోట్లంతాకూడ ఖాస్సాములు రైతులను తొలగించేదుకు ప్రయత్నంచేస్తారు, ఆ మూలకంగా ఎన్నో తగాదాలు ఘర్షణలు సంభవిస్తాయి, అప్పుడు (rioting) జరుగుతవని తెలియజేస్తున్నాను కనుక ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులేవి ఏర్పడకముందే దీనిని అన్ని చోట్లకు వర్తింపజేస్తేనే దీనియొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము నెరవేరుతుంది. తరువాత ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము రైతయొక్క హక్కును బలపరచి రైతుకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వాలని అనుకోన్నప్పుడు, దానికి తగిన సౌకర్యాలు ఈ బిల్లులో కలుగజేయవలసియుంటుంది. ఈ బిల్లు ఇప్పుడున్న ప్రకారం రైతుల హక్కులను సరిగా బలపరచకపోగా వంటలో వారికిచ్చిన భాగము కూడ చాలా తక్కువ 40 శతాంశము మాత్రము భాగమే వారికి కలుగ

[Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah] [3rd December 1952]

జేశారు. ఇది రైతులకు అంత ప్రోత్సాహకరముగా ఉండదు. వంటిలో ఎక్కువ భాగము ఖాస్వాముల కివ్వడమే కాకుండా ఆ పాలమునుంచి వచ్చే గడ్డిని గూడా ఆధిక భాగము ఖాస్వాములకే ఇవ్వాలని అంటున్నారు. ఈ ప్రకారంగా ఇచ్చినట్లయితే, ఇంక రైతులకేమి గిట్టుతుందో, వారికి ఏమి ప్రోత్సాహముండగలదో ఊహించుకోవచ్చును. అంతేకాకుండా అనేక చోట్ల గుంటూరు క్రిష్ణా జిల్లాలోను, మరయు విశాఖ జిల్లాలోను చూపినట్లయితే చాలా పాలాలు అగ్రహారాలు క్రిందికి రావడం లేదు, లేక పోతే ఖాముల క్రిందికి రావడం లేదు మొత్తము మీద అక్కడ ఉన్న రైతాంగం తరతరాలుగా ఆ పాలాల మీద పనిచేస్తున్నారు. అటువంటి రైతాంగాన్నంతా ఈ నాడు పాలమునుండి వెళ్లగొట్టడం జరుగుతుంది. అటువంటిప్పుడు, మీరు ఇకముందు ఎప్పుడో వారికి హక్కు ఇస్తామంటే, అప్పటిలోగా ఎంతమంది రైతులను ఖాములనుండి తరిమివేయడం జరుగుతుందో వారి స్థితిగతులు అప్పటివరకు ఏమి గావాలి? ఆ పోయినటువంటి ఖాములను మరల వారికి ఇవ్వగలరా అని అడుగుతున్నాను. ఒక సారి ఖామినుండి తొలగింపబడిన తర్వాత అతనికి హక్కు పోయిందని చివరకి దిక్కులేనివానిగా చేసివేస్తారు. వారిని రివిన్యూ మంత్రి శ్రీ మాణిక్యవేలు నాయకరుగారుకాని ముఖ్య మంత్రి శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారుకాని రక్షించగలరా, వారి బిడ్డలగతి, వారి కుటుంబ స్థితి, వారి హక్కుస్థితి విచారించగలరా తరతరాలుగా, ఎవ్వ సమవత్తాలుగా ఆ పాలములో పనిచేస్తూ ఉండినటువంటి tenants ను ఈ రోజు వెళ్లగొట్టడం జరుగుతున్నదంటే, వారికి ఇప్పుడు రక్షణ ఇవ్వకుండా ఎప్పుడో ముందివ్వటామంటే ఈ బిల్లుయొక్క ఉద్దేశ్య మెట్లు నెరవేరుకో నాకు బోధపడడంలేదు. ఎప్పుడైతే తంజావూరు జిల్లాకుమాత్రమే ఈ బిల్లు వర్తింపజేయబడుతుందో, అప్పుడు మిగతా ప్రాంతాలలోని ఖాస్వాములు తప్పకుండా వారి tenants ను ఖాములనుండి తొలగించి వారికి ఏలాటి హక్కులు లేకుండా చేయడం జరుగుతుంది. ఈ బిల్లు ఇతర జిల్లాలలో ఇటువంటి పరిస్థితులు తీవ్రతరము చేయుటకే సహాయపడుతుందని చెప్పక తప్పదు. ఈ విధంగా tenants కు ఎవ్వ కష్టపట్టెలు సౌభించిన తరువాత ఎవ్వ తగాదాలకు గురియై పాలములనుండి తరిమివేయబడిన తరువాత ఈ బిల్లు ఆ ప్రాంతములలో అమలుజరిపిస్తూ ప్రయోజనముండదు. అప్పటికి ఖాస్వాములంతా తమ హక్కులను భద్రపరుచుకొని ఉంటారు. కనుక ఈ బిల్లును ఇప్పుడు అమలు జరుపకపోయినట్లయితే దీనిలో ఉన్నటువంటి ఉద్దేశ్యము ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు సంబంధించినంతవరకు ఏమాత్రము నెరవేరకోగా ఇప్పుడున్న సాంప్రదాయక హక్కులగూడ tenants కు లేకుండా పరిస్థితులు తీవ్రతరం చేయుటకే ఇది రోడ్డుతుంది. ప్రస్తుతము తంజావూరులో అటువంటి క్షిప్రపరిస్థితులు సంభవించి యుండిన మాట నిజమే. అక్కడ ఇటువంటి చట్టము అమలు జరపడం అవసరమే కాని వేరే ప్రాంతాలయొక్క పరిస్థితులగూడ అదే సందర్భములూ గుర్తించి అక్కడగూడ tenants కు ఇటువంటి రక్షణ ఇవ్వవలసియుంటుంది. అట్లు గాకుండా తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఇప్పుడు విషమ పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడ్డాయి. ఖాస్వాములకు, కాలదార్లకు పోరాటాలు జరిగాయి. కనుక ఆ జిల్లాకొరకే ఈ బిల్లు తీసుకొని వచ్చాము. ఇతర జిల్లాలలోగూడ ఇటువంటి విషమ పరిస్థితులు ఏర్పడితేనేగాని ఇటువంటి పోరాటాలు జరిగితేనేగాని ఈ బిల్లును అంతవరకు అక్కడికి తీసుకొని రాము, అనేటటువంటి attitude దృక్పథము సరియైంది కాదని దాన్ని ప్రభుత్వము మార్చుకోవలసియున్నదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. లేకపోయినట్లయితే, ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలో అనేక ఘర్షణలు, పోరాటాలు జరిగి, అప్పుడు మీరు అక్కడికి పోతుంటే పంపించి,

3rd December 1952] [Sri Vavilala Gopalakrishnaiah]

riotings జరిగి, disorder ఏర్పడవలసిన కోరుతున్నావా. అదంతా సంఘవిచిత్ర తప్పదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. మరియు ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క scope ను extend చేయకపోతే, మీరు వివిధంగా tenants కు హక్కు ఇస్తున్నారు. వారికి మీరు ఏమి రక్షణ ఇస్తున్నారని అడుగుచున్నాను. కుటుంబ సంరక్షణ, రివిన్యూ సంరక్షణ గాని మా ప్రాంతాలకు వచ్చి పరిస్థితులు వివిధంగా ఉన్నాయో వచ్చి చూడమని అడుగుచున్నాను. Tanjore Ordinance pass చేసిన తరువాత ఎంతమంది tenants ను భూస్వాములు తరిమివేస్తున్నారు, వారికి ఎంత అన్యాయము జరుగుతున్నది చూడగలరు. అటువంటి పరిస్థితులలో మీద చెతులకు ఈమాదిరి అన్యాయము అక్రమము జరుగుచుండగా, వారికి ప్రభుత్వము ఈ రోజు ఏమి రక్షణ ఇస్తున్నదని అడుగుచున్నాను. కనుక గాట్లములో మొత్తంగా కొలుదారులందరికీ, మీద రైతులందరికీ న్యాయము, రక్షణ కలుగజేయవలసినట్లు, సంవత్సరముల తరబడి కష్టపడి పనిచేసినటువంటి పాలముమీద వారికి హక్కు కలుగజేయవలసినట్లు, ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క scope ను extend చేస్తూ, ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకే కాకుండా ఇతర చోట్ల నన్నిటికినూ దీనిని వర్తింపజేయవలసిన అవసరమున్నది. అప్పుడే ఈ బిల్లు యొక్క ఉద్దేశ్యము నెరవేరుతుందిగాని, ఈ బిల్లు ప్రస్తుత స్వరూపముతో ఇతర ప్రాంతాలకు చాలా ప్రమాదకరమని మనవిచేస్తున్నాను.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“The House will now rise and meet again at 3 p.m.”

(After lunch—3 p.m.)

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, yesterday I could not be present here because of the unprecedented cyclone that occurred in Tanjore, without notice perhaps to the Government and, of course, with notice to us. On the 30th morning at about 6 o'clock the weather was stormy in Tanjore and nobody thought that it would take such a turn. Towards the evening it was so bad that the people suffered a lot. Till the day before yesterday I tried my level best and even yesterday I thought of going to Tiruchi and catching the plane for Madras even though people said that the weather was bad. In view of these circumstances, I could not come here yesterday. In my absence the whole Bill has been passed and I do not know what amendments have been accepted and what amendments have been rejected. I can only presume that everything has been rejected. Now, before the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill is passed into law, this cyclone has wrought havoc in Tanjore. For about 20 hours this was going on. I heard, when I was a young boy, of some such thing as cyclone. Some time back I heard about a cyclone in Andhra Desa. I happened to be the District Secretary of the Andhra Cyclone Relief Committee and I was able to collect large amounts. This time I have to collect amounts for the benefit of people of my own place and I have to appeal to others, not only to the Government but also to others. I have heard about some such thing as cyclone when I attended some cinema. This time I actually heard that sound and I saw in front of me Calicut tiles flying like kites.”

THE HON. DR. R. NAGAN GOUDA :—“In the cinema!”

[3rd December 1952]

3-10
p.m.

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“ It happened in my own place, Sir. Many houses and huts have been destroyed. Thousands of people have been rendered homeless. (Interruption.) The Hon. the Chief Minister wants me to accept the Bill at once. How can I accept it at once in the light of what happened in Tanjore the day before yesterday? I appeal to the Government to treat Tanjore in a better way. There is no train from Tanjore to Mayuram. The railway line is all right but there is no telegraphic communication. However I was able to catch a train at Tanjore at about 3 o'clock and reach Mayuram last night at about 10-30. I took so much time to cover a distance of 50 miles or so. In the Nagapattinam line, one train capsized. Again, a big tree fell on the line before another train and the driver had to bring back the train. When he was doing so, one of the trees fell on the last carriage which was damaged. In Tanjore town itself, the District Collector and other officials tried to go round the various streets, but they could not do it as many trees had fallen on the road thus obstructing traffic. Yesterday, an urgent meeting was called for and the Collector was presiding over the meeting.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ The hon. Member is referring to the cyclone in Tanjore district. How does he connect it with the Bill before this House? ”

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—“ This is the connection, Sir. I want to point out that the present state of affairs in the Tanjore district is such and we are applying this Bill to that district. In that connection, we must know the havoc done to that district as a result of the recent cyclone, and to what amount of suffering the poor people of that district have been put. Now we are going to put into effect the provisions of this Bill for the benefit of those poor people. There was no rain at all. If there had been heavy rain, the havoc would have been greater. There was only the strong wind and gale that worked havoc. People could not go out for the whole day. Luckily for us, it was a Sunday and that too happened in day time. If it had happened during night or during day time on a working day when children might have gone to schools, then the casualties would have been greater. Most of the municipal school buildings in Tanjore have collapsed. Very many shops have collapsed. The Collector was telling me the other day that he was not able to move within the municipal limits and so he did not know the conditions obtaining in villages. Actually, none of them was able to move out of the municipal limits. I am told that in Nagapattinam, people experienced very great difficulty. The cyclone started in Nagapattinam. The Collector told me that some wireless message was received from Nagapattinam asking him to send some kerosene oil, maida and other things. But he could not send those things to Nagapattinam unless there was some aeroplane to carry them to that place. There is no possibility of taking these things to Nagapattinam by any other means. The District Medical Officer was telling that the hospital at Nagapattinam also collapsed, and that there was about 10 feet of water there. I asked him as to

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. Swayamprakasam]

what happened to the patients in that hospital. He said that he did not know anything about that, but they might have been removed to some other place. The fact is that he is not aware of the correct position. The officials are not able to ascertain the real damages in the villages. This is the state of affairs in the Tanjore district. As I said already, many of the tiles have been carried away and every person has been affected very badly."

THE HON. SRI C. SUBRAMANIAM :—" On a point of order, Sir. While we sympathise with those who have suffered from the recent cyclone, the scope of the Bill is very limited and I don't think it has any connexion with the Bill before the House."

SRI S. SWAYAMPRAKASAM :—" I have already replied to the Hon. Speaker that as the subject-matter of the present Bill is Tanjore and as we are at the third reading of the Bill, it is but fair and proper that we should take into account what happened in that district day before yesterday.

" Sir, even to-day, I am not convinced about the definition of the term 'cultivating tenant'. Even now, middlemen may come and claim that they are also cultivating tenants. If the matter is taken to court and if the court also says that the middlemen also come within the definition of 'cultivating tenant' then many tenants will be affected. The chief defects of the Bill continue to be there. For example, 'who is to harvest and who is to take the initiative?' All these difficulties will arise when the Act is actually put into force. Yesterday, before I started for Madras, a number of tenants came to me and expressed their difficulties. In a particular village, it seems, kuruvai harvest was over and paddy was on the threshing floor and the mirasdars were refusing to measure. When the matter was taken to Revenue Court, the mirasdars, it seems, told the Court that the tenants had carried away a portion of the produce after harvest without their knowledge. The tenants told me, 'Sir, the Revenue Court wants us to produce accounts for the last three years and if the accounts are not produced, the case will not be decided in our favour. Are we to keep accounts for three years? How is it possible for us, poor people, to keep accounts?' This is what they told me. The Chief Minister refused to give jurisdiction to District Courts to entertain revision petitions. He was very strong on this point, and in his anxiety to reject our plea, he said so many things against the Judiciary also. The Government do not have that much of confidence in the Judiciary as they have in the Revenue Courts.

" Sir, there is another difficulty. How are we to find out the total gross produce? Gross produce includes the yield obtained at the poradi. They do not have poradi immediately. If the relationship between the tenant and the mirasdar is not cordial, there will be lot of difficulty in this regard. Trouble will arise as to who is to take the initiative to have poradi and on what date it should be had and on what day the tenant and the mirasdar should share the produce and all that. All these difficulties will arise when the Bill is actually put into force. Of course, the Chief Minister says that

[Sri S. Swayamprakasam] [3rd December 1952]

he will look into these things and do the needful. He also says that there are the General Clauses Act and other Acts and the Government can also issue executive orders and rectify any wrong that may be committed. With all respect to the Chief Minister, I may state that so long as the present Chief Minister continues to be in office, everything will be all right and he can also claim that everything will go on well. But when a legislation of this type is brought forward, we have to consider so many other things. The present Chief Minister cannot be expected to be in office for ever and the moment another person takes up office, this Bill will be a weapon in his hands and much havoc will be done. It is in this light we have to carefully look into the several loopholes that are there in this Bill. These points should be carefully considered and we must see that there are no loopholes left. The way in which the Bill has been rushed through clearly shows that the Government are very anxious to push through this measure. Probably they have not taken into account the fact that much difficulty will be experienced by the poor peasants for whose benefit this Bill is intended. Therefore, I submit that it is not at all proper for the Government to push through this legislation which is imperfect."

3-20
P.m.

* SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, we are in the third reading stage of this Bill after having gone through nearly three days of discussion over the various amendments that were moved. In the course of the discussion of some of these amendments, the Hon. the Chief Minister stated that he was surprised—I am not quoting his exact words; I am giving the import of what he said—at the opposition to some of the provisions of the Bill from us. At one time, he said that it was more or less what I myself had demanded in the last session of the Assembly when we discussed the Budget. He added: 'You mentioned during the Budget session about the Mayuram Agreement and the Mannargudi Award; you mentioned a number of other things and I have incorporated them all in this Bill. And despite all this, you people are opposing some of the provisions of the Bill'. Sir, I would, first of all make it clear that this Bill does not contain what we asked for. Let me clear a doubt, whether it is born out of misunderstanding or out of short memory. In the last session of the Assembly, I never demanded that the Mayuram Agreement must form the basis of any piece of agrarian legislation. I never demanded that the Mannargudi Award of 1946 should form the basis of such a legislation either. What transpired in that session was this. We had repeatedly pointed out to the Government that the situation on the agrarian front was worsening day after day and that particularly after the publication of the Subrahmaniam Committee's report, cases of eviction were on the increase. Cases of eviction throughout the State not only with reference to the Tanjore district but other districts also were brought to the notice of the Government. District after district—in Andhradesa, in Malabar and in Tamil Nad—reported a number of evictions. During the course of the debate on the various items of the Budget, the Hon. the Minister for Finance repeatedly stated that the agrarian problem was the

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

thing on which they were concentrating their 'immediate' attention, to the exclusion of all other subjects. Therefore, he assured us that we might rest assured that an agrarian legislation would be brought in covering the entire State. It was in that connexion, I repeatedly said to the Hon. the Chief Minister: 'Well, you may go on cogitating about agrarian reforms; but in the meantime, people are being evicted in large numbers; why not you first of all issue an Ordinance to prevent eviction and to reinstate all those people that have been evicted?' That was specifically pointed out and that was the pointed request that was made by me as well as other Members here.

"Secondly, when I mentioned about the Mayuram Agreement or the Mannargudi Award, I pointed out that it was the landlords and not the tenants who had been repeatedly breaking the Award, violating the Agreement and going back on the solemn agreements that had been entered into. Therefore, when the Government charge the peasantry in Tanjore and other places that they are on the war path, they forget that the landlords go on evicting the tenants and subjecting them to all difficulty. Instead of taking action against such landlords, the Government take action against the peasantry. This is the specific point that I made then and make now. Therefore, it is not correct for anybody to say that we had demanded the incorporation of the provisions of the Mayuram Agreement or the Mannargudi Award into a Bill. But, nonetheless, we do not want to go back on the Mayuram Agreement and the Mannargudi Award. I want to make it clear that no wrong interpretation should be put on what I said. We had demanded a legislation for the whole State so that the situation might ease and that such a legislation should not be on the grounds of disturbances but should be on the basis of justice and equity. Is it not correct, is it not right and is it not just that I took the position I did especially when other people—the Congress committees inclusive—demanded justice to be rendered to the tenants and the peasants? Therefore, to bring forward this Bill which covers only Tanjore—apart from its merits—on the floor of the Legislature is a breach of promise that was made by the Government. I make this definite charge. It is a breach of promise. I had expected in the course of the debate on this Bill itself, when Member after Member raised this question, that one of the Ministers would come forward with an assurance that they were thinking of bringing in legislation for the whole State. Even that assurance has not been forthcoming. Therefore, I make bold to say that this is a breach of promise. The reason that is trotted out for confining this Bill to Tanjore district is that conditions there are peculiar. I would like to point out that it is not an excuse that can stand because agrarian conditions in Tanjore are not peculiar to that district. There is a general misunderstanding that the system of land tenure in Tanjore, namely, the pannaial system, is something peculiar there and that the other districts have got an entirely different system of tenure. It may be that the pannaial might be peculiar to Tanjore

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

but there are other aspects to this question. For example, the tenancy system is not something peculiar to it. Apart from that, there is also the question that the entire Tanjore district is not under wet cultivation. There are places like Pattukkottai and Arantangi where cotton is grown, tobacco is grown and such other things like chillies and other commercial crops are grown. The same is the case with Coimbatore, Tinnevely or Madurai. It is true, however, that in the Tanjore district, by virtue of the fact that it happens to be a deltaic district, the major portion of land is under wet cultivation. That does not mean that there is no wet cultivation in other districts. The same system of tenure obtains in all places. You may call it by different names. In Tanjore you call it *waram* and in Tinnevely you call it *pattam*. The nomenclature might change but the same system, namely, *waram* or *kuthagai*, obtains throughout. Therefore, to say that because conditions in Tanjore were peculiar and therefore a law had to be enacted affecting that particular place cannot at any rate hold water. What is it that the Government have made? In the Preamble to the Bill, they say that in Tanjore alone the relations between landowners and their agents and pannaiyals had become strained. Sir, we sought to move an amendment to the Preamble but unfortunately that was not accepted. The Preamble says :

‘Whereas in the district of Tanjore the relations between landowners and their agents on the one hand and Tenants and farm labourers on the other had become strained, resulting in displacement of tenants . . . and agrarian crimes and disturbances.’

So, are we to draw the conclusion that here is a Government which will move only when there are agrarian crimes and disturbances? Inevitably, I would like to point out, this is the sort of interpretation that is likely to be put on the very Preamble. People would think that only when there are agrarian crimes and disturbances the Government will think of effectively intervening and doing something which will alleviate distress. That is why, we want the Government to change their attitude. Let them not think that an agrarian legislation covering the whole State will be most urgently needed only when the situation in the State worsens.

3-30 P.m. “There are certain other things in the Bill. What is it that this Bill seeks to give to the tenants? There are three things that the Bill seeks to guarantee. Firstly, security of tenure for the tenants for a period of five years. Secondly, a certain amount of share in the produce. Thirdly, as far as the pannaiyal is concerned certain regulated wages. These are the three specific things that are sought to be conferred upon the peasants by this Bill. As has already been pointed out by me, the main thing is that with regard to the share which is fixed in the Bill, it will not satisfy a majority of the tenants in the district. As far as the wages are concerned we are not making any quarrel, because we ourselves realize that to-day in a number of cases where pannaiyals are engaged by small landowners and the tenants themselves, it would be difficult under the existing conditions, agrarian and economic, for these people to pay any higher wages. We never sought to move any amendment

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Ramamurthi]

with regard to the Schedule because we felt it was a thing that we agreed to. The Mayuram Agreement is a fair one considering the conditions in the district.

“ But, with regard to the main problem, the question of sharing the produce and the question of tenure, on which the bitterest struggles have been there in that district, we want once again to emphasise that this Bill cannot guarantee to the tenants the minimum amount of security that is needed for them and secondly, it cannot guarantee to them the minimum amount of money that they would require in order to give their best for improving agriculture and thus increase food production. The other day we demanded that it must be laid down by law that the landlord must be compelled to advance money for the purchase of manures and applying it to the field. It was not for nothing that we said that. After all the Hon. the Chief Minister ought to know that the yield per acre in Tanjore is far less than the yield in other districts. It is not because of the agrarian trouble that the yield is low there. Then why is it less? In Tanjore it cannot be said that after the Kannambadi Dam was built and the Mettur Dam was built the silt does not come through and therefore the yield has fallen. If you take Trichinopoly district, on the banks of the Cauvery you will find that the yield is nearly one and a half times the yield in Tanjore. Why is it so? It is primarily because the landlords in Tanjore have not been paying sufficient attention with regard to the manuring of their fields. I am prepared to prove this fact. For example, chemical manuring of the fields is a rarity. It may be in a few areas, chemical manuring is common. But chemical manuring of the fields has never been predominant in Tanjore district. That is why we insisted on the landlord advancing money to the tenant to purchase chemical manure so that the tenant could easily procure the chemical manure, apply it to the field and increase the yield per acre. This has not been accepted by Government. But experience will teach them the folly of their not accepting it. To-day it is said: ‘ You the Communist agitators and for the purpose of agitation you might say anything ’. But I say, Sir, these are hard realities which cannot be disproved. I am prepared to stand any enquiry to prove it.

“ Since these things have not been accepted, my own feeling is that this Bill will not fulfil the expectations that have been raised by this Bill. It is expected that as a result of this Bill, food production in the Tanjore district will increase tremendously. I am not at all hopeful of that. (Interruption.) Because the main ingredient that is necessary for increasing the food production in that district has not been provided for in this Bill. Even though the landlord does not pay the money for making available the manure, if the Government are prepared to come forward and advance money,—I am not particular that the Government should do this—to the tenants, to purchase chemical manures and then recover the advance from the tenants, I would have absolutely no quarrel. All I am concerned about is that we must help the

[Sri P. Ramamurthi] [3rd December 1952]

tenants to purchase chemical manure and apply it to the land to increase the yield. I am not concerned whether the landlord advances the money or the Government. This is an ordinary thing which experience should teach if production had to be increased.

“ With regard to the question whether this measure will really put an end to the disputes that are there in the matter of sharing the produce, as I have said, since the Government have not accepted the principle that there must be a fair and equitable share they will continue. Of course, the Hon. Minister Sri Subramaniam might say, ‘ Mr. Ramamurthi would want the land itself to be taken away by the tenant ’. He himself admitted that it would be an ideal thing. What does he mean when he says, it would be an ideal thing? It is a thing to be desired by everybody. Therefore there is justice in that. If there is injustice, it cannot be ideal. Anyway I do not want to go into that aspect of the question now. Granting that within the framework of the Constitution regarding private property, the land is vested in the hands of the landowner, an equitable share should be assured to the tenants, a share which would be accepted by all people as fair. I have seen the draft of the latest Five-year Plan of the Planning Commission. Even that Commission has recommended that 75 per cent of the produce must be given to the tenants and only 25 per cent made available to the landlord. This is a specific recommendation made therein. I have seen this final draft report recently. When that is the recommendation of the Planning Commission itself, obviously the provision of only 40 per cent for the tenant in the Tanjore district, burdened with all other cultivation expenses, can by no stretch of imagination be called a fair share for the tenant. So long as there is no fairness or equity in this division of the produce, then inevitably people are bound to struggle for justice. Social forces are let loose, they are set in motion, because there is justice behind this social force. They stand for social equality, they stand for social justice. Therefore so long as we do not think in terms of social justice, social equality, we are bound to have these struggles. After all the peasants cannot be blamed for this. This is the one thing that I want to tell the Government. They cannot stop this struggle by means of this Bill. This will continue. The peasants have learnt already that only by means of struggle they can get anything and not by any other means. On that account I am not opposing this Bill. If the Government become wiser as a result of experience and bring forward an amendment to this Bill, well and good. Otherwise, let us wait and see what the peasants themselves will do.”

MR. SPEAKER :—“ I have forgotten to tell the House that from tomorrow the House will meet from 2 p.m. to 7 p.m. as the Upper House is also meeting. I must also inform the House that in the third reading of the Bill, speeches should be confined to matters contained in the Bill and no reference should be made to extraneous matters. Now I fix a time-limit of 10 minutes for each Member.”

3rd December 1952]

* SRI R. VENKATA JAGGA RAO :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ చట్టం తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు సంబంధించిన తవరకు కొంతకు కొంతైనా రైతులకు ఉపయోగపడుచున్నది చెప్పవచ్చును. అయితే రాష్ట్ర మొత్తమును దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని చూచినచో ఈ చట్టం వల్ల హెచ్చు ప్రాంతాలలోని కొలదార్లకు నష్టదాయకంగా పరిణమించినది చెప్పవలసింది. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్లకు, పాలేరుకు రక్షణకలుగజేస్తూ వినాడు ఆ రైసెన్సు పాస్ చేయబడినచో ఆ నాటినుంచీకూడా ఇతర జిల్లాలోని ఖాస్యాములు తమకుకూడా ఇట్టి ఆర్డినెన్సు ఏడుగులలోనైనా రావచ్చుననే భయంతో, కొలదార్లను అవతలకు నెట్టివేయడం ప్రారంభించారు. ముఖ్యంగా మా పీఠాపురం తాలూకాలో అప్పుడే పెద్ద ఖాస్యాములు, అంటే వందలకొలది ఎకరాలు ఉన్న ఖాస్యాములు తమ ఖాములనుండి కొలదార్లను అవతలకు నెట్టివేయడం నేను ప్రత్యక్షంగా చూశాను. అందుచేత ఈ చట్టం ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకుమాత్రమే వర్తింపజేయడంవల్ల ఈ ప్రభుత్వం ఇతర ప్రాంతాలలోని ఖాస్యాములందరికీ, ఇటువంటి చట్టం చేబోతున్నాం కనుక, మీరంతా బాగైత పడండి అని హెచ్చరించినట్లు పరిణమించినదని చెప్పవలసి ఉంది. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని రైతులకు కలుగ జేసిన సదుపాయాలను ఇతర జిల్లాలలోని కొలదార్లకు వెంటనే గలుగజేయరహేవడం చాలా శోచనీయమైన విషయం. ఎట్టి అలస్యం లేకుండా ఇటువంటి చట్టాన్ని రాష్ట్రం మొత్తంగా వర్తింప జేస్తారని తద్వారా మన రాష్ట్రంలోని కొలదార్ల కందరికీ రక్షణ కలుగ జేస్తారని ఆశించినవారి కందరికీ ఆశాభంగమైనదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ చట్టాన్ని ఒక్క జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేసి ఇతర జిల్లాలోని కొలదార్లకు వర్తింపజేయకపోవడం న్యాయంగా లేదనికూడా ప్రభుత్వంవారి దృష్టికి తీస్తున్నాను.

“ అంతేకాకుండా ఈ చట్టంలో పల్లయార్లకు నిర్ణయించిన హులి రేటుకూడా చాలా తక్కువగా ఉన్నది. ఈ రేటు కనీస వేతనానికన్న కూడాచానాకష్టంగా ఉన్నదని చెప్పుటకు విచారిస్తున్నాను. ఈ విషయము చట్టంలో ఉన్న క్లాజులో లోపాలన్నింటికీ ముఖ్యంగా ఒక లోపము వున్నది. అది యిది. పల్లయార్లకు నిర్ణయించిన హులి రేటు కనీస వేతనమే, లేక గరిష్ట ప్రమాణమే సరిగా నిర్ణయించబడలేదు. పల్లయార్లకు అంతకన్న తక్కువ హులి రేటు ఇవ్వరాదని నిర్దిష్టంగా ఎట్టి provision బిల్లలో లేదు. అందువల్ల పల్లయార్ల హెచ్చు హులి రేటు అడుగుటకు హక్కు ఉన్నదో లేదో తెలియదు లేదు. రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారు ఈ విషయాన్ని స్పష్టపరుస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను. చట్టంలో హులి రేటు, మగవానికి రెండు మరక్కాలు, స్త్రీకి ఒక మరక్కా చొప్పున నిర్ణయించబడింది. ఇది చాలా తక్కువ హులి అనిమాత్రం మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ తక్కువ హులితో వాళ్లు సంసారం గడవడం చాలా కష్టం. దీనికి తోడు వారికి పని ఉన్న రోజులలోనే ఈ హులి ఇవ్వబడుతుంది. పని లేని రోజులలో హులి ఇవ్వరు. ఇది చాలా అన్యాయమని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను. పల్లయార్ల అనే వ్యక్తి మా జిల్లాలోని పాలికాపుటపడివాడని నా అధిప్రాయం. అట్టివానికి సంవత్సరం పాడుగున జీతం ఇవ్వడం మా జిల్లాలో అనాది నీర్తిగా వస్తున్న ఆచారం. కాని ఈ చట్టంలో ఇతర జిల్లాలోని పాలికాపుట కలిగి ఉన్న సదుపాయాలనుకూడా తంజావూరు పల్లయార్లకు కలుగజేయక పోవడం శోచనీయమైన విషయం.

“ అంతే కాకుండా, ఇటువంటి చట్టం వస్తుందని ఖాస్యాములు 1949 వ సంవత్సరంలో తెలుసుకొనిన దగ్గరనుంచి కొలదార్లను తొలగించి చేస్తున్నారు. అనేక సందర్భాలలో కొలదార్లకు ఖాస్యాములు కొలు ముచ్చికలాలు ఇవ్వడం లేదు. వాతమూలకంగా కొలదార్లు ఖామిని సాగు చేస్తున్నట్లు ఎట్టి ఆధారాలు లేకుండా

[Sri R. Venkata Jagga Rao] [3rd December 1952]

చేయబడుతున్నాయి. ఈ విషయమై అధికారులు చాలా శ్రద్ధ తీసుకొనవలసి ఉంది. వ్రాతపూరితంగా ఉన్న రికార్డులనే నమ్ముతామంటే అనేకమంది రైతులు తొలగించి వేయబడే ప్రమాదం ఉంది. కాబట్టి ఒక్క రికార్డుల బట్టే కాకుండా, ప్రభుత్వం నియమించే కమిటీలవారు యదార్థ విషయాలను వాచుకునే సెలెక్షన్ కొనవలసిన కోరుతున్నాను. పెద్ద పెద్ద ఖాన్వాసులు కౌలుదార్లకు వ్రాతపూరితంగా ఏ కాగితం ఇవ్వరు. ఈ విషయాన్ని గుర్తించి అధికారులు ఒక్క రికార్డులను బట్టే తీర్పులు ఇవ్వకుండా చూడవలసిన అవసరం ఎంతైనా ఉన్నదని మనవి చేస్తున్నాను.

“ఈ శాసనాన్ని ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు పరిమితం చేయరని, త్వరగా రాష్ట్రమంతటికీ దానిని వర్తింపజేస్తారని, కనీసం కొందరికైనా ప్రస్తుతం ఉపయోగం కలుగుతుందని ఉద్దేశపడుతూ దీనిని నేను బలపరుస్తున్నాను.”

3-40
p.m.

* SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAI:—“Mr. Speaker, Sir, when Hon. Minister rises to reply to this debate, he may twit the members of the Opposition. It is true that there have been some Members in the Opposition who, while vehemently opposing and criticising the Bill, at the same time pleaded for the extension of its application to the rest of the State. To my mind such an approach by some Members of the Opposition appears to be somewhat legitimate, for it is due to the fact that the present Bill like the curate's egg is good in some parts though perhaps bad on the whole. What does this Bill seek to achieve? It seeks to achieve some immediate as well as some ultimate objectives. First of all the Bill seeks to provide some security of tenure for the tenant and a guaranteed wage for the pannaial. It is this particular aspect of the Bill which seems to be welcomes by one and all. But with regard to the other aspects of the Bill, viz., fixing the share of the produce, there has been no such agreement and no such welcome on the part of the Opposition Benches. The Bill fixes a certain minimum share of the produce for the tenant. It fixes a minimum wage, if we can call it a wage, for the pannaial. Even this temporary security of tenure and security of wages is set against the loopholes left for eviction on the one hand and dismissal on the other.

“Let me come to the clauses dealing with disputes arising between the pannaial and the landlord and the consequent denial of appeals to courts of law. As one who is well-acquainted with this aspect, as one who has had experience of industrial tribunals, as a person who has followed the trade union movement very closely and last of all as one who has argued before the industrial tribunals for the reinstatement of dismissed workers, I can with some authority say that it is only the employers, in most cases, who take cases to the High Courts and sometimes to the Supreme Court also. In a majority of cases, the disputes are settled in the ordinary tribunals. To that extent I think that the bar on the jurisdiction of the civil courts envisaged in the Bill is particularly welcome. But, what is to happen in case any victimization of the pannaial takes place? Suppose the pannaials form themselves into an organization for the betterment of their lot and demand certain concessions for bettering

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai]

their conditions of service and security of tenure. It is but natural to expect victimization of the pannaiyals. This may constitute a grave danger to the security of service of the pannaiyals. What does the Bill provide to meet such an exigency? Unless some rules are framed by Government, which they of course are empowered to frame under the Bill, the whole administrative machinery will not be able to prevent such a victimization. The administrative machinery may tend even to encourage such victimization. But the recourse to a judiciary bred in the traditions of freedom of contract will not provide the sought for remedy. Only militancy and organized strength can thwart such victimization.

“ Now, let me come to the ultimate objectives which the Bill seeks to pursue. The Hon. the Chief Minister issued a statement which is contained in the little pamphlet that has been given to us and which is entitled. ‘ A Fair Deal to the Tanjore Ryots ’. The Hon. the Chief Minister in one of his addresses to the mirasdars of the Tanjore district observed as follows :— ‘ Production should be your aim. Unless you give the tiller of the soil sufficient interest in cultivation, production cannot be improved. I am not advising you to give away the land to the cultivators. It is to prevent such a calamity that I have brought in this Ordinance ’. Therefore, we see that there are two ultimate objectives in this Bill. First that production should be increased as a result of the implementation of the Bill and the other to avert the danger of the land passing into the possession of the tiller. This second objective comes from the Hon. the Chief Minister who is supposed to be the pillar of the Congress Party which has categorically stated that its objective is ‘ land to the tiller of the soil ’. I cannot understand, Sir, how an important and leading member of the Congress Party, in direct contradiction to the stated objective of the party, can say that the land going to the tiller of the soil is a calamity and that such a calamity should be prevented by bringing in this particular piece of legislation. If this is the ultimate objective of this Bill, Sir, then I would submit that this Bill which attempts to stave off what may be called a revolution by this minor reform, is wholly reactionary and the concession of certain security of tenure to the tenant and certain guaranteed wage to the pannaiyal is only a minor concession.

“ Then, Sir, let us come to the other objective. It is supposed to increase production. I submit, Sir, that the present sharing of the crop will not act as an incentive to higher production. What does the Bill contemplate? The Bill lays down very clearly that two-fifths of the gross produce would go to the tenant and it also lays down in categorical terms the duties that are cast upon the tenant. The tenant is supposed to provide for the ordinary expenses of cultivation; he is supposed to incur expenditure in regard to manure and seed paddy; he is expected to maintain the water channels. So, Sir, if we take all these items of expenditure and if we also take the net produce after deducting all legitimate items of expenditure, then, I submit, the maximum that would be left to the tenant under this piece of legislation will only be approximately 20 per cent of the net produce. If 20 per cent is going to be given

3-50
p.m.

[Sri S. C. C. Anthony Pillai] [3rd Decem̄ber 1952]

to the man who by the sweat of his brow works for increased production, I submit, with the authority on the subject of tenancy legislation not only in this country but in other countries also, there will certainly be no incentive for increased production. There are countries where Governments have given artificial manure and guaranteed a price for the produce. In places where the tenant's share has been as low as laid down in the Bill and where he has been given manure, the tenant has tended to sell away that manure rather than use it for the purpose of increasing production. If as a result of his own efforts the tenant should increase production by hundred per cent, we must assume that the total amount of expenditure that will be incurred in producing that extra amount of yield should be much more than usual. But what is promised to the tenant under this Bill? We assure him a bare 10 per cent of the increased net produce! The Bill is therefore a dis-incentive to increased production. We may welcome this measure to the extent that there is some measure of security provided to the tenant and the pannaiyal. But let us be very clear with regard to the ultimate objective. It is my submission that the ultimate objective, viz., increased production, will not be subserved by this Bill and that it will run counter to the prevailing trends in tenancy and agrarian reform."

* SRI C. KANDASWAMI :—"கனம் சபா நாயகர் அவர்களே, தஞ்சாவூர் பண்ணையான் குடியானவர்கள் பாதுகாப்பு சட்டம் இப்பொழுது இறுதி கட்டத்தில் வந்து சட்டமாகப் போகிறது. அதைப்பற்றி சிலவார்த்தைகள் பொதுப்படையாகச் சொல்லுவதற்கு நான் முன் வந்துள்ளேன். தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு சூழ்நிலை சமீப காலமாக ஏற்பட்டுள்ளது. அதற்கு நீண்ட கால சரித்திரம் இருந்த போதிலும் இந்த வருஷம் சாகுபடி ஆரம்பத்தில் ஒரு நெருக்கடியான கட்டம் வந்தது. அதன் காரணமாக இந்த சட்டம் வந்திருக்கிறது என்பது எல்லோரும் அறிந்த விஷயம். இந்த சட்டத்தைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் இந்த சபையின் அங்கத்தினர்களுடைய நோக்கங்கள் யார் யாருடையது எப்படி இருந்த போதிலும் கூட இன்றைய தினம் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவில் விவசாயத்திற்கு ஏற்பட்டுள்ள நெருக்கடியை சமாளிப்பதற்காக அரசாங்கம் முன்வந்து இந்த சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்து நிறைவேற்றப் போகிறது. அதே சமயத்தில் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் எவ்வளவு தூரம் இந்த நெருக்கடியை சமாளிக்க முடியும், அது எவ்விதம் பயனடையப் போகிறது, எப்படி நெருக்கடியை தீர்க்க முடியும் என்பதை யெல்லாம் சிந்தித்துப் பார்க்க வேண்டும். அங்கு ஏற்பட்ட நெருக்கடியின் காரணமாகவும் அதுவும் நெடுங்காலமாக ஏற்பட்டு வருவதாலும் அதை சமாளிக்க ஒரு திட்டவாட்டமான ஒரு சட்டம் வேண்டும் என்பதற்காகவே இந்த சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டது. அங்கு நீண்ட காலமாக ஏற்பட்டு வந்த ஒரு நெருக்கடியை சமாளிப்பதற்கும், அந்த நெருக்கடியால் நாட்டில் ஏற்பட்ட பஞ்சம், பசி, பட்டினி முதலியவைகளை தடுக்கவேண்டுமென்ற ஒரு கருத்தை மனதில் கொண்டும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஏதாவது நல்ல ஏற்பாட்டை செய்யவேண்டும் என்பதற்காகவும், அதற்காக நில சீர்திருத்தம் அவசியம் என்பதற்காகவும் இந்த சட்டம் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. காங்கிரஸ் மகாநாட்டில் கூட காரிய கமிட்டி ஒரு ஐந்து வருஷ திட்டத்தைப் போன்று பல விஷயங்களையெல்லாம், குடியானவர்களுக்கு நிலம் கிடைப்பதைப் பற்றி, பேசிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அதனால் மக்களுக்கு எவ்வளவு சௌகரியங்கள் ஏற்படும் என்பதைப் பற்றி சொல்ல வேண்டாம். அவர்களுடைய கஷ்டங்களை நீனைத்துக் கொண்டும் அவர்களுடைய தலைவிதி என்ன வென்பதை சிந்தித்துக் கொண்டும் அவர்கள் இருக்கிறார்கள். அந்த கண்ணோட்டத்துடன் இந்த சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு பார்க்கும் போது ஏதோ ஓரளவிற்கு தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவின், நிலைமையை திட்டவாட்டமாக வரையறுக்க கூடியதாக இருக்கிறது என்பது என்னுடைய

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Kandaswami]

அபிப்பிராயம். அதற்குத் தக்கவாறு நான் சில திருத்தங்களை அனுப்பியிருந்தேன். அந்தத்திருத்தங்கள் அவசியமாக இருந்த போதிலும் அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவில்லை. இப்பொழுது அரசாங்கம் அந்த திருத்தங்களை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும் பின்னாடி அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளும் படியான நிலைமை ஏற்படும் என்பது என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம். அவைகளை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாமல் இந்த சட்டத்தை நிறைவேற்றியிருப்பது அவ்வளவு சரியானது அல்ல. இதை அடிப்படையாக வைத்துக் கொண்டு பல அங்கத்தினர்கள் பேசும்போது தங்களுடைய ஜில்லாக்களில் நூற்றுக்கு ஐம்பது என்று கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது என்று, இந்த சட்டத்தினால் அங்குள்ள குடியானவர்களுக்கு அது பாதிக்கும் என்றும் சொல்லப்பட்டது. கனம் அங்கத்தினர் முதலையா செட்டியார் அவர்கள் தன்னுடைய ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவைப் பற்றி மிகவும் பெருமையாகச் சொல்லிக்கொண்டிருக்கிறார். ஆனால் என்னைப் பொறுத்த வரையில் ராமனாதபுரத்தைப் பற்றி பேசிக்கொண்டிருப்பதில் அவசியமில்லை. ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவிலிருந்து பெருத்த அளவில் விவசாயிகள் தங்களுடைய நிலத்தை விட்டுவிட்டு தங்களுடைய குடிசைகளை காலி செய்து விட்டு ஊர் ஊராகச் சென்று பிச்சை எடுத்துக்கொண்டு ஜீவனம் பண்ணிக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள் என்பது எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். அந்த அளவில் இருக்கும்போது ராமனாதபுரம் ஜில்லாவைப் பற்றி பேச வேண்டியது அவசியமில்லை. அங்குள்ள நிலைமை வேறு. மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களில் நூற்றுக்கு ஐம்பது வீதம் வாரம் கொடுக்கப்படுகிறது என்றும் இந்த சட்டத்தினால் அங்கு பாதிக்கும் என்றும் கூறப்பட்டது. அந்தந்த ஊர்களின் வழக்கத்திற்குத் தகுந்தபடி விவசாய சூழ்நிலைக்குத் தக்கபடி வாரம் முதலியவைகள் கொடுக்கவேண்டியது அவசியம் தான். அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் அதிகம் கொடுக்க வேண்டியது அவசியம்தான். அதை ஒத்துக் கொள்ள வேண்டியது தான். அந்த நிலைமையில் தஞ்சாவூர் சம்பந்தப்பட்ட வரையில் குறைந்த பட்சம் வாரம் நூற்பது என்று கணக்கு வைத்துக் கொண்டு அதற்கு மேல் அங்கங்கே இருக்கக்கூடிய சூழ்நிலையை அனுசரித்து அங்கு இருப்பதற்கு நூற்றுக்கு இருபது கலம் அதிகமாகக் கொடுக்க வேண்டும் என்று நான் ஒரு திருத்தத்தைக் கொண்டு வந்து அதை வற்புறுத்தி சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டேன். அந்த திருத்தத்தை அரசாங்கம் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவில்லை. இப்பொழுது அதை எடுத்துக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும் பின்னாடி அதை சேர்த்துக் கொள்ளும்படியான அவசியம் ஏற்பட்டாலும் ஏற்படும். அவ்விதம் அவசியம் ஏற்படும் என்பது என்னைப் போன்றவர்களுக்கு நன்கு தெரியும்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக ஒரு வேலிக்குக் குறைவாக நிலம் வைத்துக்கொண்டிருக்கிறவர்களுக்கு இந்த நிவாரணம் கிடையாது என்று சொல்லப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதற்கும் ஒரு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்து அதையும் ஏற்றுக் கொள்ளவில்லை. அதனால் என்ன பயன் அடையப் போகிறார்கள் என்பதும் தெரியவில்லை. இதனால் விவசாயிகள் பயன் அடையப் போகிறார்களோ இல்லையோ இதனால் சிறிய மிராசதாரிகளுக்கும் ஏழை குடியானவர்களுக்கும் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கும் மோதல் ஏற்படுத்துவதைத் தவிர வேறு பயன் ஒன்றும் அடையப் போவதில்லை. அதற்கு வேண்டி கொண்டு வரப்பட்ட திருத்தத்தைப் புகுத்துக் கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. பின்னால் அதற்கும் திருத்தம் கொண்டு வரும்படியாக இருக்கும் என்பது தான் என்னுடைய அபிப்பிராயம்.

“அடுத்தபடியாக இந்த சட்டத்தை மாகாணம் பூராவிலும் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவர வேண்டும் என்றும் தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிற்கு மட்டிலும் என்ன வென்றெல்லாம் கேட்கப்பட்டது. அதைப் பற்றி பல அபிப்பிராயங்களும் சொல்லப்பட்டன. இந்த சட்டத்தை எடுத்துக்கொண்டால் பொதுவாக நான்கு விஷயங்களை மாகாணம் பூராவும் எடுத்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். அதில் ஒரு விஷயம் பண்ணையாள் என்பது. இது தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவிற்குத் தான் பயனுடையதாக இருக்கும். தஞ்சாவூர் ஜில்லாவின் பண்ணையாள் முறை வேறு. அந்த முறை மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கு ஒத்ததாக இல்லை. அதற்குத் திருத்தங்கொண்டு வந்து விட்டால் மற்ற விஷயங்கள் எல்லாம் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் பொருந்தும் என்பதில் சந்தேகம் இல்லை. அந்தந்த ஜில்லாவிற்கு தக்கவாறு இந்த சட்டத்திற்கு திருத்தம் கொண்டு வந்து

[Sri C. Kandaswami] [3rd December 1952]

அதை மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டு வரலாம். அப் பொழுதுதான் இது பல ஜில்லாக்களுக்கும் பொருந்தும். இதை அரசாங்கம் செய்திருக்கலாம். இனிமேலாகிலும் மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களைப் பற்றி யோசனை செய்து அங்கும் இதைக் கொண்டுவரலாம் என்று நினைக்கிறேன்.

4 p.m. “ அடுத்தபடியாக இந்த சட்டம் இன்றையதினம் நிறைவேரப்போகிறது. இதிலுள்ள சிலவிஷயங்களினால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு பயன் ஏற்படப்போகிறதோ இல்லையோ அது வேறு விஷயம். அது வேலை செய்யும் விஷயத்தைப் பொருத்திருக்கிறது. இந்த சட்டம் சரியான முறையில் நடைபெறுதபடி இருக்க மிராசதார்கள் பிரயத்தனம் செய்து கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். சமீபத்தில் மிராசதார்கள் கும்பகோணத்தில் மகாநாடு கூட்டி சில தீர்மானங்கள் நிறைவேற்றி இருக்கிறார்கள். அதை சபையின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன். இந்த சட்டம் இப்பொழுது இந்த சபையில் சட்டமாகப் போகிறது. அதை அமுல் நடத்தும்போது மிராசதார்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தை எந்த விதத்திலும் பிரயோசனப்படாமல் இருக்கும் படியாகவும் இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்தப்பட முடியாமலிருப்பதற்கு என்னென்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமோ அதைச் செய்வார்கள். இதை யெல்லாம் செய்வோம் என்று இன்று அந்த மகா நாட்டில் சவால் விட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இதை அரசாங்கத்தின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வருகிறேன். கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இந்த சட்டத்தை போட்டுவிட்டு அந்த ஜில்லாவிற்குப் போன போது அங்குள்ள பெரிய மனிதர்கள் எல்லாம் பிரதம மந்திரி அவர்கள் பெரிய சட்டத்தைப் போட்டு விட்டார்கள், இதைக்கொண்டு வந்து விட்டார்கள் என்று வாழ்த்தினார்கள். அன்று வாழ்த்திய வாய்களெல்லாம் இன்று மௌனம் சாதிக்கின்றன. அவர்களெல்லாம் இந்த சட்டம் பலனடையாமல் செய்ய திட்டமிட்டுக் கொண்டிருக்கிறார்கள். இந்த சட்டத்தை அமுல் நடத்த முடியாமலிருக்க என்னென்ன செய்ய வேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்வார்கள் என்பதை தெரிவித்துக் கொண்டு அதற்கு வேண்டிய ஏற்பாடுகள் செய்ய வேண்டும் என்று கேட்டுக்கொண்டு இந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் நான் பேசுவதற்கு சந்தர்ப்பம் அளித்ததற்கு என்னுடைய வணக்கத்தை தெரிவித்துக்கொண்டு என்னுடைய பிரசங்கத்தை முடித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, we see here universal appreciation of the Bill from all sides of the House, of course with some reservation with reference to certain details from some of the hon. Members of the Opposition. I was very carefully hearing the speech of the hon. Member Sri C. Kandaswami coming from Tanjore. I may say at the outset, though he belongs to the Opposition, he has generally accepted the principles underlying the Bill and has welcomed this measure. But the whole trouble seems to be based on a misconception—I do not mean to put it on any ignorance of facts, but rather on wanton misunderstanding purposely misconceived. The very object of the Bill, everyone knows, is simply to improve certain agrarian conditions which have deteriorated in the sense that of late for the last four or five years the relationship between the landowner and the tenant is getting strained, and there is displacement of tenants. That is the main object. Even during the last elections, everywhere it was stated by the Communist friends that tenants were being evicted on a mass scale in Tanjore district. That was the main grievance of the other side. To see that such a displacement is not allowed any longer and to restore the peaceful conditions and maintain a sort of cordial relationship between the landowner and the tenant, our Revered Rajaji has come forward with great statesmanship and boldness by promulgating an ordinance. In the

3rd December 1952] [Sri S. Venkatarama Ayyar]

beginning there was appreciation from the land owning people. But what do we find now? We know the resolutions passed at the mirasdars' conferences at Kumbakonam and Mayuram. Of course, I for the moment do not propose to say that there is much force in the contentions put forward in the resolutions passed at those conferences; but objections have been raised by the landowners against the latest provisions incorporated in the Bill. Of course, criticism is welcome. But criticism for criticism's sake is a thing that cannot be tolerated. But we have to see the provisions that have been newly incorporated in the Bill.

"Incidentally I may also refer to the speech made by the hon. Member Sri Swayamprakasam. Just as he came to-day after witnessing the severe storm at Tanjore, he perhaps wanted to depict what exactly took place in Tanjore. It appears to me that it has got a direct bearing on the question we are now discussing on the floor of the House. The situation, that has been created on account of the cyclone has to be seen from the point of view of how we are going to work this Bill when it becomes an Act and fulfil the provisions contained therein. As it is, the relations are already strained. Now, Nature also is against us. There is a storm and there is discontent everywhere. It is all the more reason that we have to work the Act in the spirit in which it is conceived. There is no use picking holes and lacunae here and there and saying that we have not gone far enough and that land reform has not been done in the way in which others would like to have it. There are some customary practices prevailing in the Tanjore district. Now, the tenants have been given 40 per cent and the mirasdars 60 per cent. Originally the tenants were getting only 20 to 25 per cent. Sir, hon. Members of this House barring a few individuals like Mr. P. Ramamurthi and some others may not know the actual conditions prevailing in Tanjore district. Previously the tenants were being given only 20 to 25 per cent and 30 per cent in very rare cases. Now they are given 40 per cent. The complaint is that they are not given 60 per cent. Even with regard to catch crop, they were previously getting 50 per cent. Now the landlord is given only one-fifth and I may even say that it is a pittance from the view point of the landholders. What is the reason for expropriating the landholders' share? Is it not expropriation? I am not holding any brief for the landholders. The amendment fixing 20 per cent to the landlord and 80 per cent to the tenant was moved by the Opposition and accepted by the Government. I only want to show as instance whether such amendments will go to settle the agrarian unrest or whether they will aggravate the disturbances. The Opposition Members also wanted to move amendments to the effect that if a pannaiyal is not reinstated as required by the Conciliation Officer, the landholder should be not only penalized by being made to pay damages, but he should also be imprisoned. Is it the way in which we should look at the problem?"

MR. SPEAKER :—"Let the hon. Member speak on the provisions of the Bill."

[3rd December 1952]

* SRI S. VENKATRAMA AYYAR :—" Sir, I only wanted to say to what extent our Reverend Rajaji has gone to meet the demands of the tenants. The tenants have been given substantial concessions. Of course, landlords also may have their own grievances. We know how proprietary rights have been conferred on the ryots in inam and zamindari areas by giving ryotwari pattas to the tenants. Similar rights may be conferred on these tenants also."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Many hon. Members want to take part in the third reading also. So I fix a time-limit of five minutes to each Member."

4-10
P.m.

SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not know why the Chair should be so very uncharitable when my chance comes to speak."

MR. SPEAKER :—" Many Members want to speak; it is uncharitable on the part of Members to accuse the Chair."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM :—" Mr. Speaker, Sir, belonging as I do to the Opposition, I still venture to congratulate the Government on carrying through this measure; for they have taken the right step in the right direction, though the step is niggardly in scope. Sir, I should have expected the Government to be more liberal in their objective. What are the objectives in the Bill? Though the objectives are laudable to a certain extent, the remedy suggested in the Bill is only moderate in its scope. In the Preamble it is stated that in view of the disturbed conditions prevailing in the Tanjore district, the Government are bringing forward this Bill. Do they expect that such kind of disturbed conditions should prevail in the other districts also so as to enable them to give succour to the suffering tenants in those districts also? Sir, the very word 'pannaiyal' is a degrading one. It is an anti-social term; it is offensive to the decency of any citizen. It amounts to serfdom. Because we did not like the word 'Adi-Dravida', or to be plain, the Tamil word 'pariah', we have introduced a new word 'Harijan'. Such being the case, why do you want to perpetuate a degrading name by means of your legislation? I should have welcomed it if the Government had substituted this word 'pannaiyal' by the term 'agricultural farm labourer'."

(At this stage Sri C. Kandaswami occupied the Chair.)

" As regards general land reforms, a committee was appointed, over which Mr. Subrahmaniam presided, and the suggestions made by that committee were more liberal than the niggardly proposals of the Government to-day. There it was stated that 55 per cent and 45 per cent of the produce should be the shares of the tenant and the landowner. I do not see why our Government should stick to 40 and 60."

SRI C. RAJAM RAMASWAMI :—" Is 'niggardly' parliamentary, Mr. Chairman? "

3rd December 1952]

TEMPORARY CHAIRMAN (Sri C. Kandaswami):—"It is parliamentary."

* SRI K. VINAYAKAM:—"Mr. Chairman, Sir, my time is being taken up by the Opposition. (Laughter.) I wish that the landed gentry, like the mirasdar are liquidated instead of being killed inch by inch. I would rather welcome the Government to liquidate that class by even expropriating land or by giving them compensation or even by putting some restriction that so much of extent of land only should be owned by an individual, instead of a person possessing thousands of acres. That would have been more welcome instead of this *laissez faire* policy which is adopted to-day. I would also add that I expect other and better measures, such as one for liquidating the matadhipatis. They are all only absentee landlords; they have no interest in the land, nor in the production of foodcrops on their lands. I therefore suggest that such lands may be brought under co-operative cultivation which has proved successful—not in Russia, because they may not like that example, but—in America, on which country they depend mostly.

"Sir, our Government headed by Rajaji, should take the note of warning that I give them now. They are sitting upon a volcano to-day. The volcano is composed of the mirasdar of the Tanjore district. (Interruption.) No doubt, we are very good friends; but we only want to put them in the proper track. The mirasdar have convened a conference and they have objected to the levy system. They are saying they will even carry on a no-tax campaign against you. Why, they are even organizing to fight the next elections. (At this stage, the Chairman sounded the gong.) One minute, Sir. They feel that their cause is not at present championed properly in this House. So, I am sounding a note of warning in this House that this Bill has got to be worked properly and correctly. We are behind you in carrying out the provisions of this Bill. (Applause.) Sir, the same conditions as in the Tanjore district are obtaining in the Madurantakam taluk of the Chingleput district. If you come to our district and see things for yourself, you will find the conditions are very miserable. So, when you think of extending the scope of this Bill to other areas, please remember Madurantakam."

* SRI K. V. RAMESAM:—"Sir, I must register a strong protest on behalf of my party against the partiality shown towards the Tanjore tenants and against the Government having ignored the agitation that has been carried on for so many years in the other parts of the State, particularly the agitation carried on by this party for the betterment of the conditions of the tenants in the whole State. Sir, this is a very unhappy thing and it casts a gloom in the minds of not only the Members inside the Legislature, but of the people living in all parts of this State. I therefore submit that Government must very soon prepare a Bill comprehensive enough to satisfy the needs of all tenants occupying holdings in all parts of the State. This is the view expressed not only on behalf of the party, but I may say it is the view of all Members who have spoken one after another on this Bill.

[Sri K. V. Ramesam] [3rd December 1952]

"Coming to the merits of the Bill, Sir, I find there is little solace for the tenants even of Tanjore. For instance, the security that is afforded to them is only for five years which is a hardly sufficient period for instilling any enthusiasm or incentive in them to grow more food—which is the main object of this piece of legislation. The attempt on the part of the Opposition to confer occupancy right was unfortunately defeated, and even the amendment which sought to fix a period of ten years was defeated. That shows the mentality of the Government, viz., that they are not for giving proper protection and security of tenure to the tenants.

"Coming to the question of shares, I must say it is a most unfortunate provision that we have made now, so far I can see; for, if a tenant wants to grow more food for the benefit of the entire community, there must be sufficient incentive for him to do it in the shape of his getting a legitimate share of the produce, that is raised. Two-fifths of the total produce is insufficient to create a sufficient incentive in the tenant to grow more food in his holding.

"Then again, the clause relating to eviction is unhappily worded. For instance, greatest power is conferred on revenue officers particularly in the matter of disposing of all applications for eviction. There is a clause giving power to the revenue officers to dispose of such applications summarily. It is really sad to think that an amendment which was sought to be made on behalf of the Opposition for carrying the matter to a district court was negatived. That shows the fear which the present Government have, regarding this aspect of the case. There should be an equal opportunity for both the tenant and the landowner to seek remedy in a civil court, particularly when, as pointed out by the Leader of the Opposition, there is generally some difficulty of interpretation only on questions of law in regard to the various clauses; and a provision to that effect should have been incorporated in this Bill.

"Lastly, Sir, let me on behalf of the tenants of the Tanjore district, congratulate the Government on having extended to them at least this much of benefit, and I also appeal to the Government that similar benefits should be extended to the ryots in general in the other areas of the State within a very short period."

4-20
P.m.

* SRI G. SATYANARAYANA :—“అధ్యక్షా, ఈ Tanjore Tenancy Act ను తీసుకొనివచ్చినప్పుడు రాష్ట్రము మొత్తము అనేక ప్రాంతాలలో కొలుదార్లు అందరకు కూడా వర్తింపజేస్తారని చాలా ఆశతో నిర్దిష్టించుకొనియున్నారు. కాని ఇప్పుడు యీ నాలుగు రోజులనుంచి జరిగినదాన్ని చూస్తే ఇప్పుడు ఎక్కడ సవరణలతో ప్యాను అయిన దానినిబట్టి చూస్తే యీ యాక్టు అన్ని ప్రాంతాలకు వర్తింప జేయకపోవడము వారిలో చాలా నిరాశపూత్రం కల్పించుతుంది. ఇప్పటికే తంజావూరు Ordinance ప్రకటించినప్పటికీ అనేక జిల్లాలలో యీ కొలుదార్లను తొలగించడం ఆసేబటువంటిది జరిగింది. ఉదాహరణకు రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారి దృష్టికిని, ముఖ్య మంత్రి శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి దృష్టికిని తీసుకొని రాబడినటువంటి విషయమే ఒకటి ఇక్కడ తెలుపుతున్నాను. గత పదిహేను సంవత్సరాలుగా ఒక రైతు భూములను పొగుచేసుకొన్నాడు. ఈ రైతు పొలములలోనే యిల్లు కట్టుకొని పొగు

3rd December 1952] [Sri G. Satyanarayana]

చేసుకొన్నాడు. ఆమువంటి రైతును ఆ భూమిలో వేసుకొనియున్న యిట్లను కీకి వేసి బలవంతముగా ఆ భూములనుండి తొలగించడము జరిగింది. ఈ రైతు యితర రైతుల సహాయముతో ఆ భూమినుండి తొలగకుండా భండవలచినపుడు పోలీసు సహాయంతో భూమినుంచి తొలగించారని రెవిన్యూ మంత్రిగారికి, ముఖ్య మంత్రిగారికి తెలియజరుచుకోవడంకూడ జరిగింది. కాని యంతవరకు దానిపై ఏమి చర్య తీసుకొనలేదు. అదే విధంగా రాష్ట్రములో అనేక ప్రాంతాల్లో రైతులు, కౌలుదార్లను వరసగా వెళ్లగొట్టడము జరిగింది. ఈ Tanjore Ordinance ప్రకటించగానే యిది రాష్ట్ర మంతటను వర్తింప జేస్తారనే భయాంకోశనలతో యీ భూస్వాములు రైతులను తొలగించారు. యింకను తొలగించడము జరుగుచున్నది. ఇట్లు జరుగుచుండగా రాష్ట్రములోని అనేకమంది రైతులు, కౌలుదార్లు మహాసభలు జరిపి వారియొక్క కష్టములు శుద్ధిచేయుమొక్క దృష్టికి తీసుకొనిరావలసినప్పటికి, యీ చట్టాన్ని దురదృష్టవశాత్తు రాష్ట్రమంతటికి వర్తింపజేయకుండా ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే వర్తింపజేయడము అంతసవ్యమైన పనిగా కనబడుచులేదు. ఆయితే యీ చట్టము ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించి ప్యాసు చేసినప్పటికి, యీ చట్టాన్ని త్వరలోనే యీ రూపములో కాకపోయినా మరొక రూపములో మిగతా జిల్లాలలోని పరిస్థితులు దృష్టిలో పెట్టుకొని, ఈ వెళ్లగొట్టబడే కౌలుదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకు అనుగుణకు తీసుకొనివస్తే చాలామందిదని చెప్పుచున్నాను. అటువంటి చట్టము యీ కౌలుదార్ల రక్షణకుగాను చాలా అవ్యవసరమని చెప్పుచున్నాను. ఈ విషయము నేను యీ కౌలుదార్ల పరిషత్ ప్రాధికారాలచారిగారికి మనవి చేయుచున్నాను. అందుచేత యీ చట్టాన్ని యిప్పుడు ప్రస్తుతము వంటి పదలొనైనా, కొన్ని సవరణలతో తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు యిప్పటికైనను ప్రభుత్వమువారు ప్యాసుచేసినందుకు ప్రభుత్వాన్ని అభినందింపక తప్పదు. ఇదే మాదిరిగా ప్రభుత్వమువారు రాష్ట్రములోని అన్ని జిల్లాలకు వర్తింపజేసే చట్టాన్ని త్వరలో తెస్తారనే ఆశ, యీ కౌలుదార్లలో వుండును. గనుక ప్రభుత్వము రాష్ట్రములో కష్టములకు పాల్యదీనమువంటి యీ రైతులు, కౌలుదార్ల రక్షణ కొరకై మరొక చిట్టను త్వరలో ప్యాసు చేస్తారని ఆశను యింతటితో ముగిస్తున్నాను."

*SRI K. R. SAMBANDAM:—“கனம் உதவி சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே, இந்த விவசாயிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டமானது மூன்றாவது முறையாக இந்த சபையிலே விவாதத்திற்கு வந்திருக்கும் இந்தச் சமயத்தில் நான் ஒரு சில வார்த்தைகள் சொல்ல ஆசைப்படுகிறேன்.

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தை விவசாயிகளின் பாதுகாப்புக்காக கொண்டுவரும் போது அதில் என்னென்ன இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதைப்பற்றியும் குறிப்பாக ஒரு வேலிக்குப்பட்ட மிராசதார்கள் பண்ணையாட்களுக்குக் கொடுக்கும் படியான கூலியில் சில குடும்பங்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன. அதைப்பற்றி விளக்கவேண்டுமென்றும், ஒரு வேலி நிலம் பல கிராமங்களில் இருப்பவர்களுக்கும் இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாக விலக்கு அளிக்கப்படுகிறதென்பதைப் பற்றியும் அப்பீல் இருக்கவேண்டும். அதாவது இப்பொழுது ரெவின்யூ கோர்ட்டு வைத்திருக்கப்படியான முறையானது சட்ட விவாதத்திற்குக் கட்டுப்படாமலிருப்பதால் அது சரியான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்குப் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்கக்கூடியது; அவர்கள் அதற்கு மேற்கொண்டு அடீபீல் செய்ய வேண்டுமானால், ஹைகோர்ட்டுக்குத்தான் போகவேண்டிய நிலை இருப்பதை மாற்றியமைக்கவேண்டுமென்றும் திருத்தப் பிரேரேபீணை கொடுத்தும் சர்க்கார் அதை கவனிக்காதது வருந்தத்தக்கது.

“காம்பென்ஸேஷன் என்ற ஒரு முறையில் ரூ. 300 பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று’ இருந்தது. அதில் ஏற்கெனவே உள்ளபடி ரூ. 50 என்று இருந்தால் சௌகரியமாக இருக்குமென்று திருத்தம்

[Sri K. R. Sambandam] [3rd December 1952]

சொல்லப்பட்டது. இந்தப் பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்ற முறையில் பார்க்கும்போது, அதே சமயத்தில் சிறிய மிராசதாரர்களைப் பாதிக்காத முறையில் இருக்கவேண்டுமென்பதை முக்கியமாக கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொண்டால் அது ஏற்கனவே இருந்ததைப்போல் இருந்தது நலமாக இருக்குமென்று திருத்தப் பிரேரணை கொண்டுவரப்பட்டது. ஆனால், அதை யெல்லாம் சர்க்கார் கவனத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ளவில்லை.

“குறிப்பாக, பார்க்கப்போனால் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் அதிக நிலம் படைத்தவர்கள் ஒரு சிலர்தான் இருக்கிறார்கள். அதிலும் முக்கியமாக கவனித்தால் அங்கிருக்கும் பெரு நிலச் சுவாஸ்தாரர்கள் என்று சொல்லக் கூடியவர்கள் திருவாவடுதூரை, தருமபுரம், திருப்பனந்தான் போன்ற மடங்களுக்குச் சொந்தமான ஆயிரக்கணக்கான வேலி நிலங்கள் இருக்கின்றன. அந்த நிலங்களை நேரடியாக குடியானவர்களுக்குச் சாகுபடிக்குக் கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லியும், அங்கு middlemen என்று சொல்லக் கூடியவர்கள் இன்னும் இருக்கக்கூடிய நிலைமையில்தான் இந்த சட்டம் இருக்கிறதே தவிர, இது நடைமுறையில் விவசாயிகளுக்கு பாதுகாப்பு அளிப்பதாக இல்லை. இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலம் சர்க்காரே மறைமுகமாக middlemenக்கு ஆதரவு கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள் என்று சொல்லக்கூடிய நிலைமையில் இருக்கிறது.

“கனம் அங்கத்தினர் ஒருவர் இப்பொழுது சர்க்காருடைய கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவந்தார் அந்த நிலங்களைக் கூட்டுறவு சங்கங்கள் மூலமாக ஆங்காங்கே விவசாயப் பண்ணைகளின் மேற்பார்வைக்கு உட்பட்டு அந்த விவசாயிகளுக்கு பணம் வேண்டுமானாலும் சர்க்காரிலே கடன் கொடுக்கப்பட்டு விவசாயத்தை நடத்தி வந்தால் நல்ல முறையில் விவசாயம் நடக்கும் என்று. உணவு உற்பத்தியும் அதிக அபிவிருத்தி அடையுமென்பதை சர்க்காரின் கவனத்திற்கு கொண்டுவரப்பட்டும் அதையும் சர்க்கார் கவனிக்கவில்லை. ஆகையால் இந்தத் திருத்தங்களுடன் இந்தச் சட்டம் வந்தால்தான் மக்களுக்கு பிரயோஜனப்படக்கூடிய முறையில் இருக்குமென்பதைப்பற்றி சொல்லு முகத்தான் நான் இதை எதிர்க்கிறேன்.

“இந்த அவசரச் சட்டம் வரவேண்டுமென்று இருந்தவர்களில் நானும் ஒருவன். ஆனால் அதே சட்டம் எல்லோருக்கும் பாதகமான முறையில் இல்லாமல் சமுதாய முறையில் விவசாயம் நிரந்தரமாக நல்ல முறையில் நடக்க வேண்டுமென்று என்னும் கொண்டவர்களில் ஒருவரை நான் இருக்கிறபடியால், அந்த ஒரு சமூகமான நிலைமை ஏற்படுவதற்கான ஆதாரங்கள் இதில் இல்லையென்பதைக் கண்டு நான் மிகவும் வருந்துகிறேன்.

“ஆந்திர தேசத்தில் ஸைக்கோன் ஏற்பட்டதென்று கேள்விப்பட்டிருக்கிறோம். அதே மாதிரி சென்ற சில தினங்களில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் ஒரு ஸைக்கோன் ஏற்பட்டது. அதைப்பற்றி கனம் அங்கத்தினர் சுயம் பிரகாசம் அவர்கள் சர்க்கார் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவந்தார்கள். அதனால் அங்குள்ள விவசாயிகள் தான் மிகவும் அதிகமாகப் பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களுடைய குச்சு வீடுகளெல்லாம் பிரிக்கப்பட்டுவிட்டன, ஹரி ஜனங்களானாலும் சரி, மற்ற குடியானவர்களானாலும் சரி, அவர்களுடைய இப்பொழுது வீட்டெல்லாம் தவிக்கிறார்கள். கால் நடைகள் அத்தையும் பாதிக்கப்பட்டு விட்டன. ஆனால், இந்தப் புயற் காற்றினால் விளைபொருள்களுக்கு அதிகமான சேதம் இல்லை, பயிர்ச்சேதம் இல்லை யென்று சொல்லலாம். சேதம் ஏற்பட்டதெல்லாம் கரும்பு, வாழை, தென்னை மாங்கள், ஆக இவைகளுக்குத்தான் அதிகமான சேதங்கள் ஏற்பட்டிருக்கின்றன.

“கடைசியாக, இந்தச் சட்டத்தைப்பற்றி சொல்லும் போது இந்தத் திருத்தங்களில் முக்கியமானவற்றை அவர்கள் கொண்டுவராவிட்டால், இந்தச் சட்டம் கொண்டுவரும் அனால் விவசாயிகளுக்கு எந்தவிதமான பலனும் ஏற்படாது. நாங்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள், அதாவது எதிர்க்கட்சிக்காரர்கள் கொண்டுவந்த திருத்தங்கள் என்ற முறையில் அதை ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாவிட்டாலும், கனம் மந்திரி அவர்கள் சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலேயே அந்தத் திருத்தங்களைக் கூடிய சீக்கிரம் கொண்டுவரவேண்டும்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri K. R. Sambandam]

இந்தச் சட்டத்தை நடைமுறையில் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரும்போது பல கஷ்டங்கள் ஏற்படலாம். அவைகளை நிவர்த்தி செய்வதற்கு சர்க்காரே இந்தத் திருத்தங்களைக் கொண்டுவருவார்களென்ற எண்ணத்தில்தான் நான் என்னுடைய பேச்சை முடித்துக்கொள்கிறேன்.”

* SRI C. PULLA REDDI :—“ அஷ்டம், ఈ Tanjore బిల్లుకు తంజా 4-30
పూరు రైతాంగము అనేక చోట్ల పోరాటాలు జరిగినతర్వాత, రైతులకు, కాలదార్లకు P.M.
కొన్ని స్వల్ప హక్కులను యిస్తున్నా బిల్లును తీసుకొనివచ్చారు. ప్రతీకక్ష
సభ్యులు అందరుకూడ ఒక విషయాన్ని గురించి ఆసక్తిగా యీ బిల్లును రాష్ట్రానికి
అంతటకు అనువర్తింపజేయమని కోరుచున్నారు. కాని గవర్నమెంటు ప్రస్తుతము
అట్లా చేయటానికి అంగీకరించడములేదు. దీనికి ఒకే ఒక్క కారణము ఉన్నది.
అదేమిటనగా, దేశములో వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలలో అలాంటి చట్టములు
తీసుకొనివచ్చి శాశ్వతముగా వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలు పరిష్కరించుటకు ప్రభుత్వానికి
ఒక సమగ్రమైన దృక్పథము లేదు. దేశములో రైతులు కాలదార్లకు భూస్వాముల
నుండి కష్టాలు, దాడులు, భూములనుండి తొలగించడము, పోలీసు పర్యటన అనేవి
ఎప్పటికప్పుడు జరుగుతునే ఉన్నది. ఇంధకుగాను ప్రభుత్వమువారు రాజ్యాంగంగా
విశ్ కొన్ని చర్యలు తీసుకొంటున్నారేగాని దీనికి శాశ్వత పరిష్కారము జరుగుట
లేదు. ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంతవరకు Estates Land Act ఒకటి వ్యాసు చేసింది.
యీ చట్టము ఎన్నో సార్లు వ్యాసుచేసింది. 1908 లో ఒక చట్టము, 1936 లో
ఒక చట్టము, 1947 లో ఒక చట్టము, 1948 లో యింకొక చట్టము,
యీవిధముగా ఎన్నో వ్యాసుచేసింది. ఆయినను వీటియొక్క ఫలము నిష్ప
యోజనముగా కనబడుచున్నది. ఈ estates విషయములో ఇంతవరకు కూడ
తగాదాలు పరిష్కారము కాలేదు. ఈ చట్టము వచ్చిన తర్వాత దీనికి
సంబంధించిన తగాదా హోర్డులలో కొన్నియు, కుశ్రీం హోర్డులలో కొన్నియు
విచారణలో ఉన్నదేకాని వాటి అన్నిటిలో వివిధ జరుగుచున్నదో, యింత
వరకు హక్కు ఎవరికో లేబడలేదు. యిటువంటి యాక్టు వ్యాసు చేసిన
ప్రయోజన మేమని అడుగుచున్నాను. ఒక ఉదాహరణ చెప్పుచున్నాను. మా
కాలాకాలా కరివేస అనే గ్రామములో యిటువంటి మూడువేల ఎకరాల భూమి
యీనాందార్లకు రైతులకు హక్కు విషయములో తగాదాలు ఎచ్చివరి. స్పెషల్
అఫీసరు దానిని ఎత్తేటన్నారు. ట్రిబ్యూనల్ ఎన్టేటు కాదన్నారు. కలెక్టరు
Rent Reduction Act apply చేసారు. వీటన్నింటిలో భూములపై రైతుల హక్కు
విమిటా ఎవరికి తెలియడంలేదు. ఈ భూమిపై యీనాందార్లకు హక్కులను
రైతుల హక్కు ఏమి అనే విషయము యింతవరకు లేబలేకుండా యున్నాయి. ప్రతి
సంవత్సరము ఈ భూమియొక్క విషయములో పోరాటము జరుగుచునేయున్నది.
ఇటువంటి చట్టము రాష్ట్రమునంతటికి అనువర్తింపజేసేసట్లయితే యీలాంటి తగా
దాలు ఉండేవికావు. ఇప్పుడు యీ తంజావూరు బిల్లు యీ రాష్ట్రమునంతటకు
వర్తింపజేయుటకు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఎందుకు నిరాకరిస్తున్నారో తెలియడంలేదు
శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు రాష్ట్రములో భువన రైతులకు అందరి రక్షణకొరకు ఏల
అనువర్తింప చేయలేకపోతున్నారో బోధపడడం లేదు. తంజావూరులో భువన
పోరాటాలు, తంజావూరులో జరిగే కలలలాలు రాష్ట్రమంతటను ఉన్నవని గురించి
రాష్ట్రమంతట ఈ బిల్లు వర్తింపజేసేసట్లయితే గ్రామాలలో ఈ విధమైన కలల
లాలు జరుగవు. మరొక్క ఉదాహరణం ప్రభుత్వ దృష్టిలోనికి తీసుకొని
వస్తున్నాను. లింగాల అనే గ్రామములో రెండువందల యెకరాలు అక్కడ
భువన పరిజనులు ఇరవై సంవత్సరాలుగా సాగుచేస్తున్నారు. Tanjore Ordinance

[Sri C. Pulla Reddi] [3rd December 1952]

వచ్చినతర్వాత యిక్కడ జరిగిన విషయము మీదింటే యీ ఘాటు విషయములలో తంజావూరు జిల్లాలో ఉన్న ఘానమస్వయ్య వచ్చింది, ఆ ఘానాస్వయ్య అ ఘాముల నుండి వెళ్లి సామ్యుని ఆర్డరు జారీచేశాయి. ఈ హరిజనులు నిరాశ నిస్సహాయులైపోయారు. తంజావూరు జిల్లాలోని రైతులకు, కొలుదార్లు, పన్నయాలకు మాత్రము రక్షణ లిచ్చారు. శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారు యిక్కడగూడ యీ చట్టము వర్తింపజేస్తే బాగుండును అని అంటున్నారు. ఈ గ్రామములో రైతులమీద 144 సెక్షను ఆర్డరు జారీచేసి వీరిని వెళ్లగొట్టడానికి ప్రభుత్వమే యీ చర్య జరుపుచున్నది. ప్రతి పక్ష సభ్యులు అందరు యీ హరిజనులకు యీ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రము అంతటకు అడులు జరిగేటట్లు చేస్తామని ఎన్నో వాగ్దానాలు హరిజనులకు చేసియున్నారు. ఆ వాగ్దానాలు అన్నియు యిప్పుడు నిష్ప్రయోజనము అవుతున్నవి. యిప్పుడు ప్రభుత్వము ఇది ఒక నిష్ప్రయోజనమైన బిల్లును తెచ్చిందని హెచ్చరిక చేస్తున్నాను. ఈ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రమంతటకు వ్యాప్తితము చేయక పోవడము బహుశా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ప్రదేశము వేరుగా కనబడుచున్నది. బహుశా రాష్ట్రములోని ఘానాస్వయ్యలందరికీ తగిన సాంకాశము, వారియొక్క ఘానాస్వయ్యలను త్వరగా స్వాధీనపరచుకొనుటకును, వారికి పున్నటువంటి ఘాములకు సంబంధించిన రికార్డు అంతయు జాగ్రత్త పరచుకోగలండులకు తగిన సాంకాశము కలుగజేయటానికిన్ని, తంజావూరు బిల్లు రాష్ట్రమంతటకీని వర్తింపజేసే లోపల ఘానాస్వయ్యలు తగు జాగ్రత్త వుండుకొని, మేల్కొన గలండులకునూ, వారు ప్రస్తుతములో రాష్ట్రమంతటకీని వ్యాపింపజేయుటకులేదని బోధపడుచున్నది. బహుశా యీ ఘానాస్వయ్యలు వారియొక్క పరిస్థితులు చక్కబరచుకొన్నతర్వాత, యీ బిల్లును notification ద్వారా రాష్ట్రమున కంతటకు విస్తరింపజేస్తారని హెచ్చరిక చేస్తున్నాను. నిజముగా శ్రీ రాజగోపాలాచారిగారి ఉద్దేశ్యము యిదే అయినట్లయితే, వారు అట్లా జరిపేలోవున్న రాష్ట్రములో చాలా తీవ్రమైన పరిణామాలు ఏర్పడును అనే సమ్యక్తముతో చెప్పుచున్నాను. రాష్ట్రము వ్యవసాయ సంబంధాలు కలిగిన ప్రదేశము అని వారికి పూరిగా తెలుసును. చాలాకాలముగా జీవనమువల్ల కష్టించేటటువంటి యీ రైతులకు, కొలుదార్లకు వెంటనే తగిన రక్షణకు ఒక సమగ్రమైన చట్టాన్ని తీసుకొనివస్తేనేగాని యీ ఘానమస్వయ్య పరిష్కారము కానేరదు. అందుకని నేను ముఖ్యముగా వారిని కోరేది యేమిటంటే యీ కొలుదార్ల రక్షణకు రాష్ట్రమంతటికీ వర్తింపజేయుచట్టు మరొకదాన్ని తీసుకొని వచ్చి వ్యవసాయమునకు సంబంధించిన ఆర్థిక సమస్య పరిష్కారమునకు తోడ్పడుటకు ప్రభుత్వము వారు వెంటనే మరొక బిల్లును తెస్తారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.”

[illegible]

[Sri P. Chokkalingam] [3rd December 1952]

“அது மட்டுமல்ல. சென்ற பட்ஜெட் கூட்டத்திலும் கூட சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் உள்ளவர்கள் சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் தீர்ப்பின் பிரகாரம் ஒரு சட்டம் அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரப்படவேண்டுமென்று பல மெம்பர்கள் பேசினார்கள், என்பதையும் சர்க்காருக்கு ஞாபகமூட்ட விரும்புகிறேன்.

“முக்கியமாக இன்றைக்கு இருக்கக்கூடிய பெரும்பான்மையான விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமானாலும், அல்லது உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவேண்டுமென்றாலும், விவசாயத்திலே ஊக்கமும் நம்பிக்கையும் ஏற்படவேண்டுமென்றாலும், என்னைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் இன்றைக்கு சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டி என்ன தீர்ப்பு அளித்திருக்கிறதோ அதில் ஒரு அம்சத்தை, அதாவது ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு பயிர் செய்ய அவர்களுக்கு உத்தரவாதம் அளிக்கக்கூடியதை நிரந்தரமாக்கி, மற்ற அம்சங்களையும் சட்டபூர்வமாகக் கொண்டுவந்தால் என்னைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் பரிபூரணமாக அதை நான் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவேன். நம்முடைய மாகாணத்தில் இருக்கக் கூடிய ஜனங்கள் தற்கால ரீதியில் அதை பரிபூரணமாக வரவேற்பார்கள். அவர்களுக்கு ஓரளவு திருப்தியும் வாழ்க்கை சௌகரியமும் ஏற்படுமென்று சர்க்காருக்கு நான் உணர்த்திக்கொள்ள விரும்புகிறேன்.

“ஆனால், இன்னொரு விஷயத்தையும் நாம் பார்க்கவேண்டும். உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதென்பதில் சர்க்கார் கவனம் செலுத்தவேண்டுமென்றாலும், அல்லது சாதாரணமாக விவசாயிகளின் வாழ்க்கைத் தரத்தை உயர்த்தவேண்டுமென்றாலும், இன்றிருக்கக்கூடிய நிலையில் இந்தச் சட்டம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப் பொறுத்தவரையில் ஓரளவுதான் செளகரியம் செய்திருக்கிறது. இது போதாது. ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு ஓரளவு விவசாயிகள் அந்த நிலத்திலிருந்து அப்புறப்படுத்தப்படமாட்டார்கள் என்று இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் இருந்தாலுங்கூட மிராசதார்கள் அந்த விவசாயிகளை அப்புறப்படுத்துவதற்குப் பலவிதமான சாக்குப் போக்குகளைச் சிருஷ்டிக்க முடியும். அவர்களுக்கு இன்னும் அதிகாரங்களும் சௌகரியங்களும் இருக்கின்றன என்பதைப் பல திருத்தங்கள் மூலம் சர்க்காருக்கு அறிவிக்கப்படும் அதை சர்க்கார் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளாதது வருந்தத்தக்கது. குறிப்பாக, தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிற்குக் கொண்டுவரப்பட்டிருக்கும் இந்த சட்டமானது மற்ற எல்லா பகுதிகளிலும் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட திருத்தத்தை சர்க்கார் ஏன் ஏற்றுக்கொள்ளவில்லை என்பதை என்னால் புரிந்துகொள்ள முடியவில்லை.

(At this stage Mr. Speaker occupied the Chair.)

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் குடியானவர்களுக்கு ஐந்து வருஷத்திற்கு உத்தரவாதம் இருக்கின்றது. இன்னும் அடுத்தபடியாக 40% குடியானவர்களுக்குக் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய ஒரு சிறிய சலுகை இருக்கிறது. திருநெல்வேலி பகுதியிலே, குறிப்பாக என்னுடைய தொகுதியிலே, நீண்டகாலமாக விவசாயிகளின் மத்தியில் ஊழியம் செய்துவந்திருக்கிறேன். அந்த சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் பல கிராமங்களில் விவசாயிகள் யுத்த காலத்தில் ஏற்பட்ட விலைவாசிகள் உயர்வின்காரணமாகவும் வேறு பல காரணங்களினாலும் அவர்களுக்கு இருக்கின்ற வருமானமானது போதவில்லை என்ற காரணத்தால் ஒரு பெரிய விவசாய எழுச்சி தாலாகா முழுவதும் ஏற்பட்டதென்பதை சர்க்கார் அறிந்திருக்கலாம். அதே சந்தர்ப்பத்தில் நான் குறிப்பாக சில பகுதிகளில், சுமார் 3, 4 கிராமங்களில் ஆங்காங்கு மிராசதார்களுக்கும் விவசாயிகளுக்கும் மத்தியஸ்தம் செய்து, ஒரு 40% விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கிடைக்கும்படியாக ஒரு சமாதான ஒப்பந்தமாக ஏற்பாடு செய்து கொடுத்திருக்கிறேன். ஆனால், ஒரு ஆண்டு வரையில்தான் அது நிலத்திருந்தது. அடுத்த ஆண்டில் மிராசதார்கள் பலவிதத்தில் அவர்களுக்கிடையே ஒரு பிளவை உண்டுபண்ணிக் கொண்டு, கொடுத்த அந்த சலுகையைப் பறித்துக்கொண்டார்கள். ஆகவே, இதையெல்லாம் பார்க்கும்போது, சட்டபூர்வமாக 40% உத்தரவாதம் அளித்திருப்பதை நம்முடைய மாகாணம் முழுதிலும் உள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்குக் கிடைக்கும்படிச் செய்தால் விவசாயிகள் வரவேற்கக்கூடியதாக இருக்கும் என்று சர்க்காரின் கவனத்திற்குக் கொண்டுவர விரும்புகிறேன்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Chokkalingam]

“ முக்கியமாக, இன்றைக்கு இது ஓரளக்கு வரவேற்கப்படுகிறதென்றும், சர்க்கார் தரப்பில் ஏற்கனவே கொடுத்த வாக்குறுதிப்பட்டியும், இன்னும் தேர்தல் காலத்தில் பல காங்கிரஸ் அபேட்சகர்கள் கொடுத்த வாக்குறுதிப்பட்டியும், இன்றைக்கு இருக்கின்ற சாதாரண உழவர்களுக்கு நியாயம் கிடைக்கக்கூடிய வகையிலும், அடுத்தபடியாக உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கான ஊக்கத்தையும் நம்பிக்கையையும் அளிக்கும் வகையிலும், இன்றைக்கு இதை இன்னும் மாகாணம் முழுவதிலும் விஸ்தரிப்பதோடல்லாமல், சுப்ரமணியம் கமிட்டியின் தீர்மானச் சட்டபூர்வமாக அமுலுக்குக் கொண்டுவரவேண்டுமென்று சர்க்காரைக் கேட்டுக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். ஆகவே, இந்த மசோதாவை நான் வரவேற்று என்னுடைய பேச்சை இத்திடன் முடித்துக்கொள்ளுகின்றேன். ”

“SRI M. HANUMANTHA RAO:—“అధ్యక్ష, ఈ తంజావూరు బిల్లులో ప్రధానమైన లోపాలు కనపడవుటకేని దీన్ని నేను బలపరచుచున్నాను. అయితే గౌరవ నీయమైన ఆనేక మంది సభ్యులు తమ తమ అభిప్రాయాలు చెప్పారు. అందుల సభ్యులు చెప్పినదానిలో ఒకటికే ముఖ్య విషయమున్నది. ఈ బిల్లు తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే పరిమితము చేసి ఉండి, రాష్ట్రమంతటకును దీన్ని ప్రవేశపెట్టక పోవడమనేదే ప్రధానమైనటువంటి కొరత. దీనిని గురించి ఇంకా నేను స్పష్టముగా చెప్పవలసిన పని లేదు. ఈ రోజున ముఖ్యమంత్రిగారికి నేను చేసే విజ్ఞప్తి విమిటంటే ముఖ్యంగా ఈనాడు యీ agrarian భాసమస్యనుగురించిన సంద్భోధం రాష్ట్రమంతటకును వ్యాపించి ఆనేక చోట్ల ఆనేకమైన దుస్సంఘటనలకు దారితీయుచున్నది. ఇది రాష్ట్రములో ప్రధానమైన సమస్యగా పరిణమించినది. ఇప్పటికే యీ భాసమస్యవల్ల ఏప్రాంతములో చూచినప్పటికీ రైతులు కౌలుదార్లు ఆరేకమైన విరుగులుగా ఏర్పడి తమిళనాడునుండి తెలుగు జిల్లాలకు, కాయంనీరు జిల్లాలనుండి సర్కారు జిల్లాలకు, సర్కారు జిల్లాలనుండి మరొక చోటికి, యీ విధముగా ఒక ప్రాంతమునుండి మరొక ప్రాంతానికి ఇల్లువాకిట్లు విడిచిపెట్టి జీవనబృతికొరకు వలసపోతున్నారు. ఈ విషయము ప్రభుత్వమువారికి గోచరమగుచు నేయున్నది. ఈ బిల్లుఒక తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రము యీ భాసమస్యపరిష్కారమునకు వర్తింపజేయుచు ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఆలోచనకృష్టి పడడమనేది సమంజసముకాదు. ఈ సమస్య చాలా ప్రధానమైనటువంటిది. ఇది రాష్ట్రమంతటను వ్యాపించింది. అందుకనే రాష్ట్రములోవున్న అన్ని జిల్లాలలో ఉన్న తీవ్ర హస్తీతులనుబట్టి యీ ప్రతిరక్షసభ్యులు యీ బిల్లు విషయములో ఆనేక మంది ఆనేక సూచనలుచేసి రాష్ట్రములోని పరిస్థితుల కనుగుణంగా సవరణలను తెచ్చిఉన్నారు. ఈ సవరణలు యిచ్చినవాడు అందరుకూడా ఈ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రవ్యాపితముచేస్తాననే దృష్టితోనే సవరణలు ప్రతిపాదించారు. ఇప్పుడు ఈ బిల్లుకు రెండవ రీడింగు అయిపోయిన తర్వాత దీనిని ఆమోదించకముందు, ఇంకొనువున్న కొన్ని ముఖ్యమైన లోపాలు పరిశీలించవలసియున్నది. గా ఎనెన్ని సమావేశంలో మంత్రిగారు చేసిన వాగ్దానం మరిచి పోగూడదు. వీరు చేసిన వాగ్దానలయొక్క ప్రధాన అత్యంతము రాష్ట్రమంతటికీ వర్తింపజేయకుండా ఒక్క తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు మాత్రమే ఇప్పుడు వర్తింపజేయుము అని సంకల్పి పడటమనేది సమంజసముకాదు. ముఖ్యంగా ఈ బిల్లు రాష్ట్రములోని కౌలుదార్లకు శాశ్వత జిరాయిటీపాకుల రక్షణ లభ్యముచేయవలసినటువంటిదై యున్నది. ఇదే చాలా మంది కోరుతుంటే విషయము. దురదృష్టవశాత్తు చాశ్వత రక్షణ అనేది ఇక్కడ తిరస్కరించడము జరిగింది. ఇది చాలా ముఖ్యమైన విషయము. రాష్ట్రములో కౌలుదార్లు యీ భాసామునుండి ఎన్ని ఇబ్బందులకు గురిఅగుచున్నారో ప్రభుత్వము గుర్తించినట్లు లేదు పోనీ, శాశ్వత రక్షణ ఇవ్వకపోయినను, ప్రతిపక్ష సభ్యులుచేసిన పది సంవత్సరముల రక్షణకుగాను సవరణ ఆమోదించమని కోరి

[Sri M. Hanumantha Rao] [3rd December 1952]

సప్పటికి కనీసము యీ 10 సంవత్సరముల పద్ధతినూడా కాంగ్రెసు పార్టీ వారు ఆంగీకరించలేదు. అందుకు కాంగ్రెసు వార్షిక కార్యదర్శి ఇచ్చినటువంటి సమాధానమేమిటంటే కాంగ్రెసు ముందు ఎప్పుడో యీ రైతుల విషయములలో కొలుదాని రక్షణకు బిల్లు తెస్తాము, మీకు అందరికీ అంతా చేస్తాము, దీనికొరకు నిరీక్షించుకొని కూర్చున్నాండి అని. కాని 6 సంవత్సరముల పరిపాలనలో ఇంగ్లండుకు నిరీక్షించుకొని కూర్చున్న యీ కొలుదానికు ఆకాంక్ష ఉంది. నేటికి ఈ పది సంవత్సరముల పరిమితి అయినను కాంగ్రెసు వార్షి అని చెప్పుకునే ఈ ప్రభుత్వమువారు అంగీకరించక పోవటము అన్యాయము. అలాగే ప్రభుత్వము కొలుదారులకు అయిది-టి రెండు వంతులు ఫలితం నిర్ణయించారు. ఇందుకు గాను ప్రతివత్స సంఖ్యలు అయినింటి చూడు వంతులు వాటా అనే సవరణ తెచ్చారు. కాని ఇదిగూడా ఆమోదించబడలేదు. ఈ విషయములో సుద్రహ్మణ్యం కమిటీవారుగూడా సిఫార్సు చేశారు. వారి సిఫార్సులు విషయము ప్రభుత్వము పాటించలేదు. రైతులకు ఈ కాస్త రక్షణ ఇవ్వకపోవటము వాణా అన్యాయము. ప్రతివత్స సంఖ్యలు ఎన్నో విధాల క్రిడాజిగోనాలవారెవరు యీ సిఫార్సులు ఎందుకు నిరాకరించారని ప్రశ్నించగా జవాబు: వారు commit కాదలచలేదు కాబోలు సలకకుండా కూర్చున్నారు. కట్టబడి అయిన రైతులకు కొలుదారులకు రక్షణ ఇవ్వమనేకదా ప్రతివత్స సంఖ్యలు కోరియున్నారు. కాబట్టి ప్రభుత్వమువారు ఇటువంటి బిల్లును రాష్ట్రస్థాయిపేరం చేసారని ఆశిస్తున్నాను.”

4-50
p.m.

* SRI P. JEEVANANDAM:—“சட்ட மன்றத் தலைவர் அவர்களே ! இந்த மசோதா மூன்றாம் முறையாக இந்த மன்றத்தில் இப்பொழுது வந்திருக்கிறது. இது வரையில் இதன்மேல் பேசாத நான் இரண்டு வாரத் தைகள் இந்த முறை சொல்வதற்கு நிற்கிறேன்.

“இந்த மசோதாவைப்பற்றி சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலுள்ள கனம் வெங்கட்டராமய்யர் டீ.சுகிர்பொழுது ஒரு உண்மையைக் கொண்டு வந்தார். அதாவது தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவினுள்ள நிலைமையைப்பற்றி தஞ்சை ஜில்லா வாசிகளுக்கு நன்றாகத் தெரியும். எதிரி தரப்பிலுள்ள கனம் ராமமூர்த்தி, கனம் மணலி போன்றவர்களுக்கும் எனக்கும் மிகவும் நன்றாகத் தெரியுமென்று குறிப்பிட்டார்.

“இந்த மசோதா மூன்றாம் முறையாக சபையின் விவாதத்திற்கும் வரும் இன்றளவும் என்போன்றவர்கள் பலர் பேசவேயில்லை. இருபது மூப்பது ஆண்டுகளாகவே என்போன்றோர்க்கு தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப்பற்றிய விஷயங்கள் தெரியும், இருந்தும் கூட இரண்டு தரப்பிலிருந்து பேசிய பலருடைய பேச்சுக்களையும் கேட்டேன், சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து பேசிய கனம் வெங்கட்ராமய்யர், முத்தையா பிள்ளை, நாராயணசாமி நாயுடு போன்றவர்கள் பேசியதையும் கேட்டேன். அதாவது அந்தத் தரப்பு அபிப்பிராயத்தையும் இந்த தரப்பு அபிப்பிராயத்தையும் நான் கேட்டேன். இதை வைத்துக் கொண்டும் கனம் வெங்கட்ராமய்யர் என்ன கருதுகிறார்கள். என்பதை மட்டும் சபையின் ஞாபகத்திற்குக் கொண்டு வர விரும்புகின்றேன்.

“சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து கொண்டுவரப்பட்ட மசோதாவும் அவர்களால் அடிக்கடி பிரேரிகைப்பட்ட திருத்தங்களும் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா மிராசதார் விவசாயிகளிடையே அமைதியை உண்டாக்கி உற்பத்தியை அதிகரிக்கச் செய்வாயாம். ஆனால், அதே சமயத்தில் இந்தத் தரப்பிலிருந்து எதிர்க் கட்சியிலிருந்து திருத்தங்கள் பிரேரிப்பது எல்லாம் தகராறுகளை வளர்ப்ப தற்கு, மிராசதார், விவசாயிகளிடையேயுள்ள உறவு நிலையைக் குலைப்ப தற்கு என்பது அவர்கள் அபிப்பிராயம்.

“கனம் ராஜாஜி அவர்களுக்குத் தெரியும், சர்க்காரில் இருக்கின்ற தமிழ் பத்திரிகைகளுக்கெல்லாம் தெரியும். சபையிலுள்ள தமிழங்கத்தினர் களுக்கு எல்லாம் தெரியும்; ‘மந்திரிக்கழகு வரும் பொருள் உரைத்தல்’, என்ற உண்மை.

3rd December 1952] [Sri P. Jeevanandam]

“நாளைக்கு நாட்டில் என்ன நடக்கும் என்பதை இன்றைக்கே உணர்ந்து உணர்த்தற்கு ஏற்ற வகையில் நடப்பது அவசியம். இந்த மாதிரி எந்த மந்திரியாவது நடந்திருக்கிறார்களா? 1952-ம் (வரு) தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலே யுள்ள மிராசதார், விவசாயிகள் நிலைமை ரொம்பவும் சீர்கெட்டுப்போய்விட்ட தின் காரணமாக உணவு உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்க வேண்டுமென்ப தற்காக இந்தச் சட்டத்தை கொண்டுவரப்படுகின்றது என்று இந்த மசோதா வின் பாயிரம் கூறுகிறது. மிராசதார், விவசாயிகள் உறவு நிலை சீர்கெட்டு வருகிறது என்பதை 1946-ம் (வரு)த்திலேயே உணர்ந்திருக்க வேண்டாமா? எப்பொழுது 1946-ம் வருத்திலே மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகளை வெளியேற்ற ஆரம்பித்தார்களோ நிசச் சீர்திருத்தக் கமிட்டியின் அறிக்கை சமர்ப்பிக்கப் பட்டவுடன் ஏற்றப்பட்ட கொடூர நிலவெளியேற்றத்தைக் கண்டபொழு தாவது மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகள் உறவு நிலைமை சீர்கெட்டு வருகிறது. ரொம்பவும் சீர்குலைந்து போய்விடும் என்று எதிர்பார்த்தார்களா? அதிலும் காங்கிரஸின் தூண்கள்போன்ற வாண்டையார், வடபாதி மங்கலம், குன்னியூர் ஐயர் இவர்களெல்லாம் ஆயிரக்கணக்கான விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களை நிலத்திலிருந்து வெளியேற்றியிருக்கிறார்கள். அவர்களை அப்பொழுதே அம் மாதிரி செய்யப்படாமல் தடுத்திருந்தால் இன்றைய தினம் இந்த விவசாயப் பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்பு மசோதா கொண்டுவர நேர்ந்திருக்குமாவென்று கேட்கிறேன்? அப்படி அப்பொழுது செய்யவில்லை. அந்தத் தவறால் இன்றைய தினம் ஏற்பட்டுப்போன ஒரு நிலைமையைச் சமாளிக்கக் கொண்டு வரப்பட்டதுதான் இந்தச் சட்டம்; இது தப்பைத் திருத்திக்கொள்ளும் ஒரு செயலே தவிர இனிமேல் என்ன வரப்போகின்றது என்பதை உணர்ந்து எடுக் கப்பட்ட நடவடிக்கையில்: அதை ஞாபகத்தில் வைத்துக்கொள்ள வேண்டும். இன்றைய தினம் என்ன நடவடிக்கை எடுக்கவேண்டுமென நாங்கள் திருத்தம் கொடுக்கும்போது அது எப்படி தகராறை வளர்க்கும் என்று கனம் வெங்கட்டராமையர் சொல்வாரா?

“ஒளவையார் சொன்னார்கள்: ‘சோழவள நாடு சோறுடைத்து’ என் பதாக. தஞ்சை ஜில்லா நமது மாகாணத்தின் நெற்களஞ்சியமென தான் பையனாக இருந்தபோதே படித்திருக்கிறேன். அதாவது தஞ்சை ஜில்லா, தன்வையடி தேவையோக இரண்டரை லக்ஷம் டன் அரிசையை உபரியாக பிற ஜில்லாக்களுக்கு அனுப்பி வைத்திருக்கிறது. இன்றைய தினம் அந்த ஜில்லாவின் உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருக்கிறது. அதற்குக் காரணம் தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவிலுள்ள மிராசதார், விவசாயிகளின் உறவு நிலை பாதிக்கப்பட்டிருப் பதுதான். ஆகவே, அதைச் சீமாளிக்கவேண்டும். அதற்கு ஒரு சட்டம் வேண்டுமென்பதற்காகத்தான் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் இதைக்கொண்டு வந்திருக் கிறார்கள். ஆகவே, இந்த மசோதாவின் பிரிவுகளையும், திருத்தங்களையும் விவசாயப் பண்ணையாள் நலனை முக்கியப்படுத்தித்தான் ஆராய்ந்து பார்க்க வேண்டும். சர்க்கார் தரப்பிலிருந்து எதிர்க்கட்சியார் பிரேரித்த திருத்தங் கள் எல்லாம் நல்லுறவைப்பாதித்து குழப்பத்தை அதிகப்படுத்துமென அபிப்பிராயமுள்ளவர்கள் எல்லாம் கவனிக்கவேண்டும்.

“இது பண்ணையாள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம், விவசாயிகள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டம். மிராசதார்கள் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டமல்ல. ஆகையால் சர்க்கார் தரபா ராலேயே குழப்பத்தை அடக்க சட்டம் கொண்டுவராமல் முடியவில்லை. சட்டம் வேண்டும் என்றும் பொழுதுதோல்வியை ஒப்புக்கொண்டுவிட்டார்கள் என்றே யாகிறது. அதோடு சர்க்கார் தரப்பு வெங்ஷட்டராமையர் பேசும்பொழுது முன்பு ‘தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் 20% தான் வாரம் கொடுக்கப்பட்டது. இப்பொழுது சட்டத்தால் 40% வாரம் கொடுக்கப்படும். 20% வாங்கிய இடத்திற்கு சர்க்கார் 40% தரவேண்டுமென சட்டம் போடும்பொழுது எதிர்தரப்பார் 60% தர வேண்டுமென சொல்வது அமைதியைக் காக்கலா’ என்று கேட்டார்; ‘60% தரவேண்டுமென்பது நியாயமா?’ என்று கேட்கிறவர் இது வரையில் 20% கொடுத்து வந்தோம் என்று தங்களுடைய சரண்டல் கொள்கையை ஒப்புக் கொண்டுவிட்டார். நாங்கள் விவசாயிகளுக்கு 60% கொடுக்கவேண்டும். சப்பிர மணியம் கமிட்டியாரின் சிபார்சுப்படி 55% கொடுக்கவேண்டுமென்று சொல்லு கிறோம். இப்படிச் சொல்வது தகராறை உண்டுபண்ணுமென்று சொல்லு கிறார். நிசச் சீர்திருத்தம் செய்யப்போகிறோம், என்று பறைசாற்றிக்

[Sri P. Jeevanandam] [3rd December 1952]

கொண்டது காங்கிரஸ் கட்சியில்லையா? சுப்பிரமணியம் கமிட்டியை அமைத்திருக்கிறோம். அதன் சிபார்சை செய்யப்போகிறோமென்று தேர்தல் காலத்தில் பிரசாரம் செய்யவில்லையா? அதேசிபார்சுகள் எங்கள் பக்கத்திலிருந்து சொன்னாலும் அமைதியை சூலைக்கவென்று கருதுவது?

“கடைசியாகச் சொல்லுகிறேன். ஒரே ஒரு வார்த்தை. மசோதாவிற்குக் கொடுக்கப்பட்ட பல திருத்தங்கள் நிராகரிக்கப்பட்டுவிட்டன. விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களுக்குப் போதுமான அளவு பாதுகாப்பு இல்லை. பண்ணையாட்களுக்கு மனைக்கட்டு உரிமையில்லை. அதோடு இதை எல்லா இடத்திற்கும் விஸ்தரிக்கவேண்டுமென்ற திருத்தம் ஒத்துக்கொள்ளப்படவில்லை. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவைப்போல குண்டூரிலும், கிருஷ்ணாவிலும் இதேபோல மற்ற ஜில்லாக்களிலும் உறவு நிலை பாதிக்கப்படாமலிருக்கும்பொழுதே இச்சட்டத்தை விஸ்தரிக்காவிட்டால் தஞ்சையைவிட மிக மோசமாக அவைகளிலும் நிலைமை மாறிவிடுமென்று சொல்ல விரும்புகின்றேன். சட்டத்தை விஸ்தரிக்காவிட்டால் கிராச்சி நடக்கும்.

* SRI G. NARAYANASWAMI NAIDU :— “கனம் சபாநாயகர் அவர்களே! இந்தச் சட்டம் கடைசி முறையாக விவாதிக்கப்படுகின்ற நிலைமையைக் கண்டு நான் மட்டற்ற மதிர்ச்சியை அடைகிறேன். சென்ற ஐந்தாறு வருஷகாலமாக இந்தமாதிரியானதோர் சட்டத்தை இயற்றவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணத்தில் மந்திரிசபை இருக்கும் இந்தத் திசை நோக்கியே மக்களை ஊக்கிவந்தவன் நான் என்ற முறையிலும் சந்தோஷம் அடைகிறேன். பிரசித்திபெற்ற மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தத்தை நமது அரசாங்கம் ஒப்புக்கொண்டு அதைச் சட்டத்தில் ஒத்துக்கொண்டு அதன்படி சில ஷரத்துக்களை ஏற்றுக்கொண்டதற்கும் அந்த ஒப்பந்தத்தின் ஆதி கர்தா என்ற முறையில் நான் பெருமையும், சந்தோஷமும் கொள்ளுகிறேன். இந்தச் சட்டம் விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர்களிடையே ஏற்பட்டு வளர்ந்து கொண்டிருந்த அதிகருபதியை மற்றிவிட்டது என்ற காரணத்திற்காக மாதிரம் இதை நான் வரவேற்கவில்லை. இந்தத் துறையிலே இது தான் முதன்முயற்சி. ரயில்வேயில் வேலை செய்துகொண்டிருக்கிறவர்கள் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியும். Facing point என்று சொல்லுவதுண்டு. பலமான அகலமான தண்டவாளங்களிடையே ஒடிக்கொண்டிருக்கும் ரயில்வண்டித்தொடரை, அடுத்த லயனில் மாற்றிவிட்டு இரண்டு தண்டவாளங்களிடையே ஒரு கூர்மையான அகலமற்ற தண்டவாளத்தை வைத்து அடுத்த வினாடியில் திருப்பி விட்டுவிடுவார்கள். அந்த அபாரமானதொரு காரியத்தைப் போலவே தான் இன்றையதினம் நமது மந்திரி சபையில் தலைவர் ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் ஒரு புதிய திருப்பத்திலே, தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளையும், மிராசதார்களையும், இன்றையதினம் இந்தச் சட்டத்தின் மூலமாகச் செய்திருக்கிறார்கள். இன்றையதினம் வரையிலும் சட்டத்தாலும், சமூகத்தாலும் அதிகமாகப் புறக்கணிக்கப்பட்டு வந்த விவசாயப்பெரு மக்களுக்குச் சட்டத்தால் பாதுகாப்பு அளிக்க வந்தது இந்த சர்க்காரின் மிகத் துணிகரமானதோர், அபார செய்கையாகும். மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தம் தான் அந்தத் துறையிலும் முதன் முயற்சி. மிகவும் பிரசித்திபெற்ற அந்த மாயவரம் ஒப்பந்தத்தின் வெற்றியேதான் இன்றையதினம் இந்தச் சட்டசபையில் தஞ்சை ஜில்லா விவசாயிகளின், பண்ணையாட்களின் பாதுகாப்புச் சட்டத்தைக் கொண்டுவருவதற்கு அடிப்படையாக இருந்தது. அந்த முறையிலும் நான் மிகவும் சந்தோஷப்படுகிறேன். இனிமேல் நம் எல்லோருடைய குறிக்கோள்களும் ஒன்றாகவேயிருக்கவேண்டும். எந்த இடத்திலும் மிராசதார்கள், விவசாயிகளிடையே பூசல்கள் உண்டாக்கி விவசாய உற்பத்தி பாதிக்கப்படாமல் பாத்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். தகராறு ஏதேனும் ஏற்பட்டால் அதை வளரவிடாமல் தடுப்பதற்கு இந்தச் சட்டம் இருக்கிறது. இது ரொம்பவும் பொருத்தமானதோர் சட்டமாகும். ஆகவே உணவு உற்பத்தியை பாதிக்கக்கூடிய அளவுக்கு இனி எந்தத் தகராறும் இளம்பாது. நாமும் கிளப்பிவிடாமல் இருக்கவேண்டியதும் மிகவும் அவசியம். அப்படி அமைதியான முறையிலே, புதிய தான முறையிலே, புதிய உற்சாகத்தோடு விவசாயிகள் பாடுபட்டு உழைத்தார்களேயானால் நம் நாட்டின் உணவு உற்பத்தி மிகவும் பெருகும்.

3rd December 1952] [Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu]

இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் 'மூட நெய் பெய்து முழங்கை வழி வார, கூடியிருந்து' உழவர், உரிமையாளர் எல்லோரும் ஆனந்தமாக உண்ணக் கூடிய ஒரு சபிர் நிலைமை நிச்சயம் உண்டாக்கப்படும். அதில் ஐயம் வேண்டியதில்லை. இவ்வளவு நாளாக மிராச்தார்கள், விவசாயிகள் இவர்களிடையே ஏற்பட்ட பூசல் மேலும் மேலும் வளர்ந்து கொண்டிருக்கும் என்று யாரும் கவலைப்படவேண்டியதில்லை.

'போய் பிழையும், புகுநருவான் நின்றனவும்; தீயினில் தூசாகும்,' 5 p.m. என்பதைப்போல சென்ற கால பிழைகளும் இனி ஏற்படும் பிழைகளும் அவைகள் யாவும் இந்தச் சட்டத்தினால் நிச்சயமாக மறைந்து அழிந்து போகும். ஆதலினாலே புதிய பூசல்களை, பிரச்சனைகளை கிளப்பி விடாமல், வெகு ஐக்கருதையாக இந்த உழவர் உரிமையாளர் இருசாராரும் நம் நாட்டு விவசாய உணவு உற்பத்தியில் அமைதியாக ஈடுபட்டுக்கொண்டிருக்கும் படியாக நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டியது மிகவும் அவசியமாகும். அப்பொழுதுதான் நிச்சயமாக நல்ல பலன் கிடைக்கும். ஆனால் சமீபகாலத்தில் குடந்தையில் கூடிய மிராச்தாரர்கள் எல்லோரும் ஒரு அறிக்கை விடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். ஆனால் காலத்தான் அவர்களுக்கு அவர்களுடைய செய்கை சரியானதா, தப்பானதா என்பதை உணர்ந்து கொள்ளும்படி செய்யவேண்டும். நிச்சயமாக அந்தக் காலம் அவர்களுக்கு ஒரு தெளிவையும், புதிய அறிவையும் கொடுக்கும்மென்றே நான் நம்புகிறேன். அவர்கள் ஏதோ தங்களுக்கு பலத்த சக்தியிருப்பதாக எண்ணி, தங்களால் சாதிக் முடியாத காரியமேதும் இல்லையென இறுமாந்து, வறிகொடா இயக்கத்தை ஆரம்பிக்கப்போகிறோம் என்பதாக வெல்லாம் ஐந்து கண் பூச்சாண்டி காண்பிப்பதில் பயனில்லை. இந்த ஈஜாஜி சர்க்கார் அந்த மாதிரியான பூச்சாண்டியைக் கண்டு பயப்பட்டுவா தில்லை. இந்த சர்க்காரிடம் அவர்கள் பாச்சா எதுவும் பலிக்காது. சட்டம் வந்த பிறகும் மிராச்தார்கள் பல புதிய புதிய தொல்லைகளை எழுப்பிக் கொண்டிருக்கவிடாமல் செளஜன்யமான முறையில் விவசாயிகளுடன் ஒற்றுமையாய் வேலை செய்து உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கும்படியாக சர்க்கார் எப்பொழுதும் கண்காணித்து கொண்டேயிருக்கவேண்டும். இன்றைக்கு உழவர்க்கு ஜெயமா, மிராச்தார்களுக்குச் ஜெயமா என்பது பிரச்சினையல்ல. எந்தத்தரப்பிற்குச் ஜெயம் என்று பார்த்து மார்தட்டிக் கொண்டிருப்பது தோல்விவற்ற தரப்பாரின் கோபத்தை அதிகப்படுத்துவதோடு மாதிரம் அல்ல. எதிர்த்தரப்பாருக்கு கிடைத்தவெற்றியினால் ஏற்பயிருக்கின்ற பலனை ஏற்பட்டமுடியாதபடி செய்யத்தான் வேண்டுமென்ற மன உணர்ச்சியை இயற்கையிலேயே இருதரப்பார்களிடையேயும் ஊட்டும். ஆகவே இன்றையதினம் இருதரப்பாரின் கொள்கைகளும் நம் நாட்டின் உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்கவேண்டுமென்ற எண்ணம்தான். இதில் கொள்ளைவேற்றுமை இருக்க அவசியமில்லை. இதற்கானதோர் சூழ்நிலையை சர்க்கார் உருவாக்கவேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவில் நிலைமை சீர்பட்டவுடன் இந்த மாதிரியானதோர் நிலைமை மற்ற இடங்களில் ஏற்படும் படியாக நாம் பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். எருக்களை தாராளமாக விநியோகம் செய்யவேண்டும். நல்ல நஞ்சை பூமியில் வாழை, கரும்பு போன்ற தானியங்களைப் பயிரிடாமல் பார்த்துக்கொள்ளவேண்டும். ஆக உணவு உற்பத்தியைப் பெருக்குவதற்கு என்னென்ன ஏற்பாடுகளையெல்லாம் செய்யவேண்டுமோ அதையெல்லாம் செய்யவேண்டும். தஞ்சை ஜில்லா தன்னுடைய தேவை போக மிக மிக அதிகமான தானியத்தை வெளி நாட்டிற்கு ஒரு காலத்தில் ஏற்றுமதி செய்து கொண்டிருந்திருக்கிறது. தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவின் தாராள கொடை மனப்பான்மையையும், வளத்தையும், செழிப்பையும், வெள்ளாமைமையையும், மக்களிடையே ஏற்பட்டிருந்த நாகரீகம், கலை, தெய்வ உணர்ச்சி போன்றவற்றின் சிறப்பையும் பாடாத புலவர்கள் கிடையாது. எனக்கு இப்பொழுது ஒரு பாடல் கவனத்திற்கு வருகிறது.

‘ஈதலும்பல கோலாபூஜையும்
ஒத லும்குண ஆசார நீதியும்
ஈரமுங்குரு சீபாத் சேவையும் மறவாத
எழ்த லம்புகழ் காவேரி யால் விளை
சோழ மண்டல மீதே,’ என்பதாக அவர் பாடியிருக்கிறார்.

[Sri G. Narayanaswami Naidu] [3rd December 1952]

மற்றைய ஜில்லாவாசிகளான எனது நண்பர்கள் இன்றையதினமும் சோழமண்டலம் இப்படியிருப்பதாக யாரும் கருதக் கூடாது. இன்றைய தினம் ஈதலோ, இதலோ, நீதியோ, சேவைவோ எதுவும் கிடையாது. வறுமைதான் எல்லோரிடையும் மிஞ்சிக்கிடக்கிறது. அரைபடி நெல்லுக்கு தகராறு போட்டுக்கொண்டு இன்றையதினம் ஆறு கோட்டுகள் ஏறிஇறங்கிவிடு கிறார்கள். இவைகள் எல்லாம் உண்மையில் மறைந்தாகவேண்டும். நாட்டின் உண்மை நிலைம் எல்லோருக்கும் தெரியப்படியாகச் செய்ய வேண்டும். நான் படித்தகாலத்தில் ஒரு விஷயம் கவனித்திருக்கிறேன். தஞ்சை ஜில்லாவை “சோழநாட்டு நெற்களஞ்சியம்,” என்பதாக அழைத்தார்கள். சொல்லிக்கொடுத்திருக்கிறார்கள். தன் ஜில்லாவின் தேவையையொத்திரம் அது பூர்த்தி செய்து கொள்ளவில்லை. மற்றும் பல ஜில்லாக்களின் தேவைகளையும் பூர்த்தி செய்ததால்தான் அதற்கு இந்தப் பெயர் ஏற்பட்டது. விவசாய, மிராசு, ஆகிய இருதரப்பாரிடையேயும்தான் ஊக்கம் குன்றிற்று. பூசல்கள் அதிகமாயிற்று. சோம்பேறித்தனமும், சுயநல நோக்கமுமே அதிகமாக வளர்ந்து விட்டது. அவைகள் எல்லாவற்றையும் ஒரு அதிர்ச்சியை போல இந்தச் சட்டம் ஒரு தாக்கு தாக்கிவிடும். புதிய விழிப்பு, புதிய ஊக்கம் இருதரப்பாரிடையேயும் இப்பொழுது காணப் படுகிறது. ஆகவே விவசாய வளர்ச்சியைக் கருத்தில் கொண்டு இருவரும் பாடுபடும்படியாகச் செய்யவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டம் உழவருக்கு மிகவும் உதவியாக இருக்கும்படிச் செய்யவேண்டும். பல இடங்களில் பலமுள்ள மிராசுதார்கள் ஏழை விவசாயிகளை நசுக்கிவிடத்தான் பார்ப்பார்கள். அங்கே யுள்ள விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு காட்டுவதைப்போல பலமிக்க விவசாயி காளால் மிராசுதார்களின் நலனும் சட்டத்தில் கண்டபடி அவர்கள் உரி மையை அவர்கள் அடையும்படி பார்த்துக் கொள்ளவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தால் பலவிடங்களிலும் விவசாயிகளுக்கு ஆதரவு மிகவும் அதிகமாக இருக்கிறது. பெரிய குத்தகைக்காரராக இருந்தும்சூட நண்பர் சம்பந் தத்தைப் போன்றவர்கள் இன்றையதினம் குத்தகை ஒழியவேண்டுமென்று பேசுவதைக் கேட்டு மிகவும் அவர்களேப் பாராட்டுகிறேன். பலர் இம்மாதிரி இன்றையதினம் விவசாயிகளுடைய நண்பர்களாகப் பேசுவதைக் குறித் தும் மகிழ்ச்சி அடைகிறேன். இவைகளையெல்லாம் விவசாயத் தொழிலாளர் களின் வெற்றிக்கு அறிகுறியென்றே நான் கருதுகிறேன்.

“இந்தச் சட்டத்தில் பல குறைகள் இருப்பதாகச் சொன்னார்கள். அந்த குறைகள் எல்லாம் நிச்சயமாக நடைமுறையில் வரும்பொழுது நிவர்த்திசெய்யப்படுமென நம்புகிறேன். அதோடு மிராசுதார்கள், விவ சாயிகள், பண்ணையாட்கள் இவர்களிடையே புதியதொரு ஊக்கத்தை உண்டு பண்ணவேண்டும். யார் மிக அதிகமாக உற்பத்தி செய்கிறாரோ அவ ருக்குப் பரிசு வழங்க வேண்டிக் வேண்டும். எவ்வளவு நிலத்தில் பயிரிட்டார்கள், செலவு என்ன, என்பதையெல்லாம் வைத்துக் கொண்டு மிகக் குறைந்த நிலத்தில் யார் மிக அதிகமாக சாகுபடி செய்கிறாரோ அவருக்குப் பரிசு வழங்கவேண்டும். இந்தச் சட்டத்தோடு அந்தமாதிரியாகவும் சீர்திருத்தங் கள் வந்தால் நிச்சயமாக மிகவும் அதிகமாக உணவு உற்பத்தி செய்யப் படும்கு.

“மிராசுதார்களின் சலசலப்பைக் கண்டு இந்தச் சர்க்கார் அஞ்சாது என்று நான் கருதுகிறேன். ஆகையால் தைரியமாக இந்தச் சட்டத்தை விவசாய மக்களின் நலனில் அக்கறையுடைய ராஜாஜி அவர்கள் கொண்டுவந்ததற் காக நான் விவசாயப் பெருமக்கள் சார்பாக கனம் முதல் மந்திரி அவர் களுக்கும் ரெயின்யூ மந்திரி அவர்களுக்கும், இந்தச் சபையிலுள்ளோர் களுக்கும்கு எனது நன்றியை தெரிவித்துக் கொள்ளுகிறேன்.”

SRI T. C. NARAYANA NAMBIAR :—“മാനന്തല അദ്ധ്യക്ഷനവർ കേളേ! ഈ ഹാളിൽ പല ഭക്ഷകളിലും പാത്രപത്തിലും ഈ നിയമത്തെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു കേരളം പ്രസംഗങ്ങൾ ചെയ്യുകയുണ്ടു്. എന്നാൽ എനിക്ക് പറയാനുള്ളതു് മലയാളികളായ എം.എൽ.എ. മാർ ഈ Tanjore ബില്ലിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചു് ഉള്ള വാദപ്രതിവാദങ്ങളിൽ ഗവർണ്ണമെന്റ് കൈക്കൊള്ളുന്ന നിലപാടു് സന്തോഷം പരിശോധിച്ചുകൊണ്ടിരിക്കുവാൻ. എന്തുകൊണ്ടെന്നാൽ മലബാർ കടിയായു ദേശത്തി നിയമം ഗവർണ്ണമെന്റിന്റെ ആലോചനയിൽ ഉണ്ടെന്നുണ്ടല്ലോ ബഹുമാനപ്പെട്ട വസ്തു മന്ത്രി അഭിപ്രായപ്പെട്ടതു്.”

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. C. Narayana Nambiar]

എന്നാൽ 'ഭാവിശ്രവപി ക്രമശക്തം കണ്ടുപോൽ' എന്ന പറയുന്നപോലെ ഈ തഞ്ചാവൂർ ഫിഫ്തിനെ പററിയുള്ള ഗവണ്മെന്റിന്റെ നിലപാടു കണ്ടപ്പോൾ വരാന്തി കുന്ന മലമ്പാർ കുടിയായു ഭേദഗതി നിയമത്തിന്റെ ഭാവിയിലുപരി 'കഷ്ടം' എന്ന ഒരു വാക്കുകൊണ്ടു അതിരിട്ടു കളയേണ്ടിവരില്ല എന്ന ന്യായമായി സംശയിക്കേണ്ടിവരുന്ന. ഞാൻ ഇത്രയും പറയുവാനുള്ള കാരണം വളരെ പ്രധാനങ്ങളായ ഉപദേശപങ്ങൾ കൊണ്ടുവന്നതെല്ലാംതന്നെ ഈ നിയമം അല്ലാലികമാണ്; partial, experimental, temporary എന്നുള്ള വാക്കുകൾ പറഞ്ഞുകൊണ്ടു തള്ളിക്കളയുകയും, ബില്ലിന്റെ ജീവശ്വാസം വെട്ടിത്തുടയ്ക്കുകയും ചെയ്തു എന്നുള്ള കാരണമായിരിക്കുന്നു. തഞ്ചാവൂരിൽ കുടിയാന്മാരും ജന്മിമാരും തമ്മിലുള്ള ബന്ധത്തിൽ അല്പം അധവാനമു restore ചെയ്യുവാൻ വേണ്ടിയാണ് അല്ലാലികമായി ഈ നിയമം കൊണ്ടുവന്നത് എന്നു പറയുന്നു. എന്നാൽ ഏതൊരു നിയമത്തിന്റെ ഉദ്ദേശ്യം അതു അദ്ധ്വാനിക്കുന്ന കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു അവർ ഉണ്ടാകുന്ന ഉല്പാദനം അനുദിനവർദ്ധനുള്ള അവകാശം കൊടുക്കുന്നതോ എന്നും ഭൂമിയുടെ മേൽ അവനെ ന്യായമായ അവകാശം കൊടുക്കുന്നതോ എന്നാണു്. ഇതു രണ്ടും വാസ്തവത്തിൽ ഈ ബില്ലുകൊണ്ടു കുടിയാന്മാർക്കു സിദ്ധിക്കുന്നില്ല. ഒരു ഉദാഹരണം, Sir, ഞാൻ പറഞ്ഞു കൊള്ളട്ടേ. ഭൂമിയിൽ ശാശ്വതമായ അവകാശം കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു കൊടുക്കണമെന്നാണ് ആരുടെ അവശ്യപ്പെട്ടിരുന്നത്. അതു് ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടപ്പോൾ തള്ളിവോക്കുകയാണു ചെയ്തതു്. പാണ്ഡവന്മാർക്കുവേണ്ടി ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണൻ ദുരൂഹവന്മാരെടു് പറയുകയാണ്: അഞ്ചു രാജ്യമെങ്കിലും കൊടുക്കുക, അല്ലെങ്കിൽ അഞ്ചു വീഴ്ചകളെങ്കിലും പാണ്ഡവന്മാർക്കു കൊടുക്കണം. അതുമില്ലെന്നു പറഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അഞ്ചു വീഴ്ചകളെങ്കിലും കൊടുക്കുക എന്നായി. ഈ ആവശ്യം പോലും നിരസിച്ചപ്പോൾ ഒരു വീഴ്ചകളും അവർക്കു കൊടുക്കണം എന്നു് ശ്രീകൃഷ്ണൻ പറയുകയുണ്ടായി. അതുപോലെ നിങ്ങൾ കുടിയാന്മാർക്കു സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കുകയില്ലെങ്കിൽ പാവപ്പെട്ട കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു വളരെ കൊല്ലത്തേക്കെങ്കിലും സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കണം എന്നാണ് ആരുടെ ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടതു്. എത്രയും മിതവും ന്യായവുമായ ഈ ആവശ്യം കൂടി നിഷ്ക്കരണം തള്ളിക്കളയുകയാണ് ചെയ്തതു്. സാധ്യ കൃഷിക്കാർ അവരുടെ അവകാശങ്ങൾക്കു വേണ്ടി പോരാടിയപ്പോൾ കോണശ്ശണ്ണു് ബീഗ് സേന്റർഫിതന്മാരും പറയാറുണ്ടു്: ഇതു കമ്മ്യൂണിസ്റ്റ് കാര്യം പ്രക്ഷോഭമാണു്, ഹിംസയാണു് എന്നൊക്കെ. പക്ഷെ പത്തുകൊല്ലത്തേക്കെങ്കിലും ഭൂമിയിൽ സ്ഥിരാവകാശം കൊടുക്കണം എന്നു പറഞ്ഞപ്പോൾ അതിന്നു എതിരായി വോട്ടുചെയ്തു, കുടിയാന്നു അവന്റെ ഭൂമിയിൽ ശാശ്വത അവകാശം ഇല്ലായ്മചെയ്യുവാൻ വോട്ടു ചെയ്തു് മ്യൂസിം ബീഗ് മെമ്പർമാരെയും മറ്റും മലമ്പാറിലെ കൃഷിക്കാർ നോക്കിക്കൊണ്ടിരിക്കും. ഇതു അവർ മറക്കുകയില്ല എന്നു ഞാൻ പ്രഖ്യാപിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടേ. മറ്റൊരു സംഗതി കൃഷിക്കാർ പോരാടിയ സ്ഥലങ്ങളിൽ അതിന്റെ അനുഭവം ഉണ്ടായിട്ടുണ്ടു്. ഇതു തെളിയിക്കുന്നതു കൃഷിക്കാർക്കു സംബന്ധിച്ചേക്കുന്നതും സ്ഥാപിത താല്പര്യങ്ങളെ സംരക്ഷിച്ചുപോരുന്ന ഈ ഗവണ്മെന്റ് സംഘടിപ്പിച്ചുകൊണ്ടു അവരുടെ ആവശ്യങ്ങൾക്കുവേണ്ടി അങ്ങേ അററും പോരാട്ടിട്ടില്ലെങ്കിൽ യാതൊന്നും ചെയ്യുവാൻ വോക്കുന്നില്ല എന്നതാണു്. ഇതുകൊണ്ടുതന്നെയാണ് സംസ്ഥാനത്തിന്റെ മറ്റു ഭാഗങ്ങളിലേക്കും ഈ നിയമം വ്യാപിപ്പിക്കണം എന്നു ആവശ്യപ്പെട്ടപ്പോൾ അതു് സാധ്യമല്ല എന്നു പറയുവാനുള്ള കാരണം. ഏതായാലും ഈ ചൈതന്യവേളയിലേങ്കിലും ഇങ്ങിനെ ഒരു ബില്ലിനെ സംബന്ധിച്ചേക്കുന്നതോളം ആങ്ങളുടെ അഭിപ്രായങ്ങൾ അറിഞ്ഞിരിക്കെ വരാന്തിരിക്കുന്ന മലമ്പാർ കുടിയായു ഭേദഗതി ബിൽ കൊണ്ടുവരുന്ന അവസരത്തിൽ കൃഷിക്കാരുടെ ന്യായമായ അവകാശങ്ങളും ഭൂമിയിലുള്ള സ്ഥിരാവകാശവും അനുവദിക്കുവാൻ ഉള്ള ഒരു ഹൃദയം ഉണ്ടാകണമെന്നു സവിന്യം അറിയിക്കുവാൻ ഞാൻ ഈ അവസരം ഉപയോഗിച്ചുകൊള്ളട്ടേ !”

* SRI B. LAKSHMINARASA RAJU :—“ అధ్యక్ష, ఈ తంజావూరు 5-10 p.m. బిల్లుపై ఆనేకమంది ఆనేక సవరణలు పెట్టి వుట్టాడారు. అయితే వాటికి ఎంత ప్రాముఖ్యత ఉన్నాయి! ఆనే విషయాన్ని ఆలోచించినట్లయితే ఒకదానికొకదా తగినటువంటి ప్రాముఖ్యతను ఇవ్వకపోగా, వాటిని చాలా ఆవమానకరంగా చూశారని నేను ఆభిప్రాయపడుచున్నాను. ఎందుకనగా ఉదాహరణకు మా వచ్చే గోదావరి జిల్లా ఈవిషయములూ తంజావూరు జిల్లాకు కొంచెము హెచ్చుతక్కువగా సమపోలికగా, అదే పరిస్థితులు కలిగిఉన్నది ఆలాంబపుడుకూడా ఈ వట్టాన్ని ఆ జిల్లాకు వర్తించేయలేదు. మా జిల్లానుంచి ఈ విషయమును గురించును ఆనేక పిటిషనులు పెట్టు

[Sri B. Lakshminarasa Raju]

[3rd December 1952]

కొన్నారు. కాని, వాటికి ఏమీకూడ సరియైనటువంటి సమాధానము ఇచ్చినట్లు లేదు. అక్కడ పరిస్థితులను చూచినట్లయితే, ఉదాహరణకు, 1949 లో ఆంధ్ర రాష్ట్రములో వచ్చినటువంటి cyclone గురించి పంటలుపోయి అక్కడ ఉన్నటువంటి రైతులు చాల ఇబ్బందులకు పాలైనారు. పంటలు పోవుటచే చాలామంది రైతులు చివరకు గ్రామాలలో వాళ్లకు ఉన్నటువంటి ఆస్తిని చిన్న చిన్న వస్తువులు పూసలు పుస్తెలు మొదలుకొని అన్నిటిని ఆమ్మిచ్చి కోర్టులలో డిక్రీలు పొందారు యీనానందారులు. అక్కడ రైతులు అవిధముగా ఎన్ని కష్టములు పడుచున్నప్పటికీ ఇప్పుడు ఈ తంజావూరు Ordinance ను జిల్లాకుకూడ వర్తింపజేయబడుతుందని వారు గత కష్టాలనన్నింటిని మరచిపోయి ఆ రైతులు ఎంతో ఆశిస్తున్నారు. వారి ఆశలన్నీ ఈ రోజుతో నిరాశరై పోయే పరిస్థితి వచ్చింది. అందుచేత ఈ పరిస్థితులలో ఈ బిల్లును సాధ్యమైనంత వరకు ఇతర జిల్లాలకును, ముఖ్యంగా పశ్చిమ గోదావరి జిల్లాలంటివాటికి తప్పక వర్తింపజేసేటట్లుగానైనా చూడాలని కోరుతూ ఇంతటితో విరమించుచున్నాను.”

* SRI T. VISWANATHAM :—“ Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the Ordinance was first issued, I was one of those who welcomed it for certain of its provisions, namely, the provisions relating to the security of tenure. Of course, Sir, I do not like legislation by Ordinance but all the same, when it was once issued and it had a good provision giving security of tenure to the tenants who never had such benefit for centuries, I thought it was a good thing to that extent. Subsequently when it was announced that legislation would be introduced, I thought that legislation would be introduced to make it applicable to the whole State and I did not imagine that legislation will be introduced merely to regularize the Ordinance because, Sir, as you are aware, under the present Constitution no law is necessary to regularize an Ordinance and an Ordinance has got a certain period of life and if they want to make a general law, then general legislation could be introduced. But, Sir, unfortunately it has not been so done. You have heard from both sides of the House that several Members were anxious to have legislation applicable to the whole State. It is true that there is difference of opinion with regard to certain aspects, namely, with regard to sharing of produce and also the period of tenancy right. Some are inclined to give permanent occupancy right straightway and some are not willing to do so on the ground that it will amount to expropriation and so, this has to be very carefully looked into. You are aware, Sir, in the discussion of the clauses relating to that subject, there was more or less general agreement that at least a ten-year period of security must be given to the tenants and I really hoped that the Government would agree to that at least in respect of Tanjore so that hereafter they could come forward with a Bill which is applicable to the whole State. At that time, Sir, the Hon. the Chief Minister observed that if I gave him a Bill, he would consider it and you remember, Sir, that I told him that I would give the Bill. May I tell the Hon. the Chief Minister now, Sir, that I have given notice of a Bill already and I have handed it over to the office and if the Speaker is good enough and if the Hon. the Chief Minister is willing enough, he will please give me an opportunity to enable me to move for the first reading of the Bill tomorrow because tomorrow is a non-official day. Also, Sir, it is a formal

3rd December 1952] [Sri T. Viswanatham]

matter. I do not go to the very extreme, although desirable, step with which there is no general agreement and I am making a provision for a ten-year period of security as a temporary measure pending further agrarian legislation.

"Sir, I need not go into further details. I only hope the various clauses which are unduly weighted against the tenants will not be harshly worked. I also hope, Sir, that not merely the behaviour of the tenants but also the behaviour of the landlords will be such that clause 10 of the Bill will not be put into effect and there will be no need to go to the Revenue Divisional Officer or to the Conciliation Officer with applications for eviction. I hope, Sir, after this Bill there will be some contentment and if in the working of the measure the spirit with which the provisions are made are observed by the landlords and also the officers concerned, I hope the penal clauses of the Bill and the eviction clauses will not be put in operation. I hope that the best of luck will befall the tenants of Tanjore and I wish Godspeed to the Bill."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI:—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have to say not very much because the Bill has been discussed threadbare at every stage and I do not think there is any point remaining for further explanation or elucidation. We can only deal with the general prospect before us as a result of this legislation. On the one hand, I have been reading in the newspapers, as was referred to by some of the previous speakers, that landowners of Tanjore, at any rate landholders of certain parts of the district, have met and have expressed their severe displeasure in regard to certain provisions incorporated in the Bill and they have gone so far as to use pretty minatory language and they have said they will have to resort to methods followed for attaining the independence of the country. I am, however, not much disturbed by such threats. I am only grieved at the spirit behind such language. On the other hand, Mr. Ramamurthi is here and he says that there is no reason whatsoever for him after the passage of the Bill to wind up his agitation. And so, I was ruminating over the prospect. On the one hand landowners are thoroughly dissatisfied—I do not wish to minimise their dissatisfaction because it is a fact that they are thoroughly dissatisfied—nobody will deny that; it is not merely pretence. It is not merely a sort of strategy or anything like that; they are thoroughly dissatisfied. On the other hand, I must take it at full value what has been said in front of me here by Mr. Ramamurthi: he is not going to wind up his agitation. Not that I ever believed that the party which he represents will wind up its agitation; it is an international organization with a long life and with a history behind it of a series of events and programmes and it could not be wound up by the Tanjore Tenants Protection Bill. Their agitation is only a part of their general attitude to life and to Government; it is not only a part but a temporary phase. What I mean by this description is that this is not what they stand for and what they ask for here is not what they stand for.

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

[3rd December 1952]

5-20
p.m.

" Sir, I know their philosophy fairly well—may be not so much as ardent and loyal members of the Party like Mr. Venkateswarlu and others do. They do not believe in the magic of property to which the old economists were wedded. When they argue now that the permanent interest in the land should be given to A or B or C or a tenant or whosoever it may be, in order that he may improve it and look after it well, they are talking only my language or the language of the Right and not of the Left. Really their doctrine is that property is not necessary, it is not essential and it is an illusion. They depend upon public interest, upon patriotism, upon general economic laws and the class struggle. They do not depend upon the magic of property. Yet, as a temporary phase, Mr. Ramamurthi unabashedly says, we must give an interest to any man if he is to look after production, to look after cultivation and the like. It is not that I do not like it. For the time being he agrees with me on that aspect of life. But that is not their final opinion. So, I say, the prospect is, on the one hand, the landowners are saying that this is a war upon them and Rajaji is in Ramamurthi's pocket and he has handed himself over, body and soul, to the Communists and that Ramamurthi, in fact, drafted this Bill and I have only adopted it by ' *sweekaram* ' and therefore their life is at stake and they must fight to death. On the other hand, at the end of all this trouble, Mr. Ramamurthi gives me the cheering information that they will continue their agitation. The whole object of my endeavour was not to kill any particular doctrine. Not that I believe that any doctrine could be stopped in this manner but I had hoped for calm, I had hoped for peace but he denies me that. And yet I know that in all our legislative and other efforts, really we make a great deal of noise while we are involved in it. But life will go on, apart from this legislation and apart from anything else we do. So many things are done in this world. There is a great deal of noise and tumult about it, and debate and discussion and hard swearing, but life goes on by the force of tradition and the force of habit. Luckily for us, in spite of every disturbance, the landowner by force of tradition takes some interest in the land. The cultivators too, by force of tradition and habit take some interest in the land. A man cannot keep quiet and he must work on something. Otherwise he cannot be happy. So, by force of habit and tradition, I believe that the lands in the Tanjore district and elsewhere will continue to be looked after in spite of us, either on this side or on the other side. I do hope, therefore, that in spite of what the mirasidars say at their meetings and in spite of what Mr. Ramamurthi says here, still there is something to protect us all by way of tradition and habit. Orderly life alone gives us happiness. Anything else might give us excitement, a little temporary joy but, what is called happiness will result only from permanent things. I think, the forces of Nature will help us in spite of the discussions that have been going on here. In spite of adverse criticism, Members desire the law to cover the whole State and not only Tanjore. It is curious that Mr. Anthoni Pillai drew a different moral from it for a different purpose. But it gave me continual satisfaction to

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

see Member after Member rising and speaking in various languages, that the Bill should have been extended to the whole of the State. A person might pick holes and make disparaging comments but ultimately when a man comes and says "Give me your daughter's hand", I know he is happy over and likes my 'daughter.' Therefore, I say, that this Bill, in spite of every criticism either on this side or on the other side, is welcomed by all. But, it is said that a mistake has been committed in not extending it to the other parts of the State. I feel an internal satisfaction that they really desire that it should be extended to other districts. So, there is something in my 'daughter.' (Laughter.)

"Sir, I accept the blessings of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition with very great satisfaction and pleasure. He has not only argued and he has not only set out points but he has wound up the debate like a true Brahman and wished good luck and God-speed to this Bill. Let us all disperse this evening saying God-speed to this Bill because it affects the lives of so many people.

"Now, the question is, what have I done and what this Bill proposes to do. Before I go to that, I know that people take sides. Yet I was greatly surprised at the mirasidars' discontent with my proposals. Even leading organs of the Press, whom I may count as my friends for all purposes in general, expressed grave dissatisfaction. Members have spoken here that 40 per cent is not good enough. But one of the most prominent supporters of the nationalist movement in India and one of the foremost newspapers of our land not only of this part of the country, was thoroughly dissatisfied with the proportion that we had adumbrated in the Ordinance itself, viz., two-fifths for the tenants. It was too much, they said, and there is reason for that. Mr. Venkatrama Ayyar pointed out that in most parts of Tanjore, in a large part of Tanjore, in a very important part of Tanjore, in a very fertile part of Tanjore, where land is very costly, where the channels are full of water and where the men are full of intelligence—both in mathematics and other matters they have been paying much less than what this Bill now proposes to give by law to the tenants. Only a fifth was the average in that area but we have doubled it, so to say. As I explained in the earlier phase of the discussion, that has given dissatisfaction both to my friends who do not want to wind up their agitation and to my friends on the landlords' side. The landlords say, 'We were paying only a fifth. Now it is suddenly raised to two-fifths.' Whereas my friends, the non-winders of agitation, say 'You are giving where we agitated only very little above what the people are already being given. You give much where we did not agitate.' I do not want to dilate upon it. I only want to say that people are discontented all round. Yet I hope, the whole of the House will hope for good coming out of the endeavours we are making honestly. I hope, at the end of the debate, my friends on the other side will give us the credit for having honest motives. They began by saying that it was intended

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [3rd December 1952]

to kill this and kill that, but I believe that attitude was only temporary and that at the end of it, we all unanimously believe that we desire to do something well. Only some people think that we might have done more. Some people think that we might have done less. But that does not matter. Let us hope that something will come out of this. I firmly believe that by the force of habits and traditions, men will take interest not only in their land and the welfare of their families but also in the welfare of the people round about them. Ultimately, everything will come all right.

5-30
p.m.

“ Now what have we done in this Bill? I wish to dwell for a minute on this point. We have reinstated all the tenants who were turned out as a result of disappointed hopes and fears and frustrations after the publication of the Subramaniam Committee Report. We have reinstated all of them. Mr. Ramamurthi and others wanted us to go a stage further. When we referred this Bill to a Select Committee we took time to discuss this matter at some length and it is as a result of that we have given rights of reinstatement up to a certain date back. We have also given them fixity of term. Each term is fixed. The term which till now was one year has been made into a five-year term. The one-year tenant has now become a five-year tenant. Any one let in must be accepted for five years. We have also left no doubt as to his share. We have, I think, on the whole, made provisions here, in this Bill, for a fairly generous distribution of the produce. Some arguments were heard that two-fifths was not enough. Let us improve it later if necessary. Two-fifths is not an eternal fraction. We have put it now. Let us hope it will grow, adjust or alter later; it does not matter. We have begun well and I think not ill. We have provided that the produce, if there would be any dispute about it, shall be divided on the basis of two-fifths to the tenant, and not less favourable than two-fifths. If by any process of adjustment an agreement should be entered into, by which the tenant will get something more, this Bill will not stand in his way.

“ It was mentioned that the power of collective bargaining should be retained. Both Mr. Ramamurthi and Mr. Anthony Pillai referred to it. Each referred to it in his own way. They said that we should retain the power to get more from the landowner. By all means let people bargain. But let us have peace. Much has been talked about trade unionism and collective bargaining. Each is intimately associated with the doctrine of property. It is only when Government's hands are off private enterprise that collective bargaining becomes a necessity in order that justice may be secured to the workers as against managements and capitalists. But now we are in the midst of an endeavour to establish a Welfare State where we are entitled to interfere in everything. In the management of production we are entitled to take over property, to control management, to control transport and to control movement, and all that. Therefore the State steps in in order to render justice, and there is democracy to make the State do the right thing. With the State taking care of all enterprises and of

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

production, at any rate when our creed is that we may interfere in all things, in a Welfare State and with democracy to control the State, collective bargaining becomes an old-fashioned slogan which has to be given up. Trade-unionism has no more place. All that it can do is to create confusion in the minds of the people. It has some place as there is still property and private enterprise."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" They are retiring."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" But there should be some restriction on collective bargaining, and that is the issue of the mixed position in which we are now to-day. There can be what is called collective bargaining but it can be allowed only to the extent it is good for the State."

SRI P. RAMAMURTHI :—" It recedes to the extent there is a Welfare State."

* THE HON. SRI C. RAJAGOPALACHARI :—" All things grow gradually. It is well known that we stand for a Welfare State. Collective bargaining has lost force as a slogan. It cannot have the force now as it had before. It may remain to supplement our efforts. I hope hon. Members when they work among the agrarian population will remember that a Welfare State is postponed to the extent that peace is disturbed. Welfare State and peace must go together. Otherwise we cannot produce a Welfare State. I must say here what I already said in another place. I think it is worthwhile to repeat it here and so I repeat it here; my Friends will excuse my playing the schoolmaster to some extent. It is this. Communists know that they have not a leg to stand on unless they yoke their doctrines, unless they yoke their policies to hard work, and lay down that every man should work according to capacity and fully. The doctrine of work is no less important to the Communist way of thinking than it is to the Bhagavat Gita way of thinking. Work is an essential duty and an essential condition for success according to the Communist organization. Now can we by slowing down and strikes, by encouraging a habit of not working or working less or ill, by asking the people not to work—can we produce an ideal condition of things? I would like to give here a thought to the Communists to work on. By doing something opposite to what they ultimately want they are postponing the goal to which they are moving. We must at every stage tell the people to work, we must at every stage emphasize the sacredness and the duty of working. Without disturbing that mentality they may do anything else according to their doctrines. Let my friends agitate; I have no objection. But I do not want them to tell anybody not to work, or tell anybody to stop work or slow down work. Provided they follow this advice, I do not mind what other trouble they may bring me or to the Government; I do not mind all that. (Laughter.) Work is essential.

" We have also done some minor things in this Bill. We have said that though it was the custom from time immemorial to debit

[Sri C. Rajagopalachari] [3rd December 1952]

the entire cost of manuring and all that to the tenant's share, it has become now legalised that the landowner must bear half the cost of manuring expenditure and the tenant only the other half. No doubt this was suggested by the landowners, because they got nothing by putting a load of debt on the tenants; so they said 'let us legitimise this provision.' Mr. Ramamurthi wanted not only that the landowner should bear half the cost but that he should loan the other half to the tenant. I said it was left to them to accommodate as they liked; we cannot make it compulsory that the one should lend and the other should borrow.

"As for the catch crops, Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar has explained that what is given to the landowner is only a trifle; we have given them away almost entirely to the tenant. What is given to the landowner is mere symbolic trifle. The landowner wants *ulundu* and *payaru* for his iddli and other things he wants for his kitchen. It is absurd that a landowner who owns large extents of land, at least according to law, should have to go to the market to buy a little *ulundu* or to buy straw for his cattle. So I said, 'will you be content with one-fifth of the produce.' In this I have not given anything much. It is a trifling thing; the catch crop is grown in between crops and so it does not very much matter even if the tenant took the whole of it. But anyhow we have provided a share in it for the landowner.

"In this Bill something has been done for the landowners and something for the tenants. Much has been done for the pannaiyals, more than for the others. Mr. Vinayakam does not like the word 'pannaiyal.' One who knows Tamil need not object to it. 'Pan' or 'Pannai' means farm, field, cultivation and labour for the farm and 'al' means man. Therefore there is nothing wrong in the word. There is everything good in it just as everything is good in the word 'Pappan.' It is now used to mean a bad fellow. The word 'Pappan' means one who sees, one who can read, one who could explain the scriptures to others, one to whom we go if the calendar should be read, to know when Amavasi comes, when it is a good day or a bad day and all that. It means 'one who sees.' But now it has come to mean the hated Brahman. The meaning of words changes according to conduct. Luckily the pannaiyal has not done anything wrong; he has not changed. Let not anybody object to it. It means no more than when one is called a bicycle man or a coachman or a postman. Pannaiyal is only a 'field man' or 'cultivation man.' There is nothing wrong in the word 'pannaiyal.' His position has been considerably strengthened in this Bill. He cannot be dismissed; he can take the landlord to court if he is dismissed, the tenant also may be taken to court if his pannaiyal is dismissed. His wages are fixed and made liberal.

5-40 p.m. "There is nothing wrong in any of the provisions and nobody has commented adversely on these points. He has got security of service. Apart from non-dismissal, there is the provision that he has to get twelve full months' notice before he can be sent away.

3rd December 1952] [Sri C. Rajagopalachari]

He has full twelve months ending with the agricultural year so that he can find his occupation elsewhere. So far as the pannaiyals are concerned, I have no hesitation in saying that this law has done well by them. As regards the tenants, it is a thing yet to be seen how co-operation will proceed. If my hopes are fulfilled there would be co-operation. Let me tell my Communist Friends, 'By all means do not wind up your agitation but I would request you not immediately to open the bag. Allow the Bill to have full play.' It is easy to create trouble. There is no difficulty. One man can create trouble among fifty or a hundred people. It is difficult to put down trouble because in the process of putting down trouble much other trouble arises. So, nobody wants to put down trouble by force. I hope that all Members will join and follow the lead of the Leader of the Opposition who is leading the United Democratic Front and I also hope that with the Leader, the rest also will say 'God-speed' to the Bill. Sir, this is all that I wish to say and I hope the House will accept the Bill unhesitatingly and without any mental demur."

MR. SPEAKER :—"The question is—

'That the Tanjore Tenants and Pannaiyal Protection Bill, 1952, be passed into law.'

The motion was carried *nem. con.* and the Bill was passed into law.

(2) THE INDIAN REGISTRATION (MADRAS AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952.

* THE HON. SRI K. VENKATASWAMI NAIDU :—"Mr. Speaker, Sir, I beg to introduce the Indian Registration (Madras Amendment) Bill, 1952, and move—

'That the Bill be taken into consideration at once.'

"It is a very simple matter. There were disputes between the French and British Governments as to which of them possessed sovereign jurisdiction over the loges at Kozhikode and Masulipatnam. The British Government had asserted their sovereign jurisdiction over the loges in unmistakable terms. But documents relating to the properties in the loges have in some cases been registered in French registration offices as the parties concerned were under the mistaken impression that the French authorities had jurisdiction over the loges. As the loges have been specifically included in the territory of India by a Statutory Order of the Government of India (S.O. No. 6, dated the 23rd March 1948), it is considered desirable to permit these documents to be re-registered under the Indian Registration Act, 1908 (XVI of 1908), free of all charges, so that they may be admitted in evidence in Indian courts. Sub-section (1) of new section 23-B inserted by the Bill makes provision accordingly; and sub-section (2) provides for the application of sub-section (1) to other French Indian areas adjoining Madras territory, in respect of which similar difficulties may be experienced in future."